

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

Timothy Jackson,

Plaintiff,

v.

Laura Wright, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:21-cv-00033-ALM

RE-NOTICE OF TAKING DEPOSITION

TO:

ELLEN BAKULINA

**C/O Benjamin Walton
Assistant Attorney General
General Litigation Division
Attorney General of Texas
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711
benjamin.walton@oag.texas.gov**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE: undersigned counsel will take the following deposition:

Name: Ellen Bakulina

Time: October 16, 2024, 10:00 AM, Eastern Time

Place: **This deposition will take place virtually**

upon oral examination before a Notary Public or other Officer authorized by law to take depositions in the State of Texas and videographer. The oral examination is being taken for the purposes of discovery, for use at trial, or for such other purposes as are permitted under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The deposition will continue from day-to-day until completed.



DATE: September 30, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Michael Thad Allen

Michael Thad Allen, Esq.
D. Conn. Bar No. CT29813
admitted *pro hac vice*
Lead Attorney
ALLEN LAW, LLC
PO Box 404
Quaker Hill, CT 06375
(860) 772-4738 (phone)
(860) 469-2783 (fax)
m.allen@allen-lawfirm.com

Jonathan Mitchell
Texas Bar No. 24075463
MITCHELL LAW PLLC
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 400
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 686-3940 (phone)
(512) 686-3941 (fax)
jonathan@mitchell.law

for PLAINTIFF

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the date specified in the caption of this document, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court, to be served on all parties of record via the CM/ECF system.

/s/Michael Thad Allen

Michael Thad Allen

Ellen Bakulina

University of North Texas
1155 Union Circle, Denton, TX, USA 76203

Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu
347-527-3785

EDUCATION


- 2015 PhD in Music Theory
CUNY Graduate Center, New York. Adviser: William Rothstein
Dissertation: The Problem of Tonal Disunity in Rachmaninoff's *All Night Vigil*.
- 2010 MA in Music Theory
McGill University, Montreal. Adviser: William Caplin
Thesis: Polyphony as a Loosening Technique in Mozart's "Haydn" quartets
- 2007 Bachelor of Music in Music Theory
McGill University, Montreal
- 2004 Graduate diploma in Music Theory (one year only; left the program in 2004)
Moscow Tchaikovsky Conservatory, Moscow, Russia
- 2003 Diploma *cum laude* in Music Theory, Music History, and Pedagogy
Academic Music College of the Moscow Tchaikovsky Conservatory, Russia

EMPLOYMENT

- 2016 to present University of North Texas,
Assistant Professor
- 2015–16 Yale University Department of Music
Lecturer and coordinator of the undergraduate musicianship program,
levels 1 and 2
- 2011–15 Brooklyn College, City University of New York
Instructor (Graduate Teaching Fellow and later Adjunct Professor)
- 2007–10 Schulich School of Music, McGill University
Teaching Assistant with classroom teaching duties

GRANTS AND AWARDS

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| - Enhanced Chancellor's Fellowship, CUNY | 2010 to 2015 |
| - SSHRC (Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada) Doctoral Fellowship | 2011 to 2014 |
| - Graduate Teaching Award, McGill | 2009 |
| - Schulich Scholarship, McGill | 2008 |
| - Sara Berlind Memorial Scholarship, McGill | 2007 and 2008 |



PUBLICATIONS

- 2021 “The Loosening of Closure: A Form-Functional Study of Rachmaninoff’s Solo Songs.” Forthcoming in *Theory and Practice* 45. Peer-reviewed
- 2020 “The Brigade Textbook: Disseminating the Riemannian Legacy in the Russian-Soviet Theoretical Tradition.” *Theoria* 26: 85–111. Reviewed by the editor
2020. Introduction to Russian Music Theory Panel, SMT 2018: “Theories of Harmonic Function in Russia: an Introduction to Three Essays.” *Theoria* 26: 55–60.
- 2020 “Tonal Pairing in Two of Rachmaninoff’s Songs.” In *Analytical Approaches to Russian Music*, edited by Inessa Bazayev and Chris Segall. Routledge. Peer-reviewed
- 2018 “Proto-harmony in Rachmaninoff’s sacred music.” *Intégral* 32, 15–36. Peer-reviewed
- 2017 “Canons as Hypermetrical Transitions in Mozart.” *Music Theory Online* 23.4.2. Peer-reviewed
- 2015 “Tonality and Mutability in Rachmaninoff’s *All-Night Vigil*, Movement 12.” *Journal of Music Theory* 59/1: 63–97. Peer-reviewed
- 2014 “The Concept of Mutability in Russian Theory.” *Music Theory Online* 20.3.5. Peer-reviewed by SMT program committee 2013 and by MTO editor
- 2012 “The Loosening Role of Polyphony: Texture and Formal Functions in Mozart’s ‘Haydn’ Quartets.” *Intersections*, the Canadian Journal of Music 32/2: 7–42. Peer-reviewed

IN PROGRESS:

“Leo Mazel and Linear Analysis: Revisiting Chopin’s Fantasy op. 49.” Submitted to MTO

Book project in progress: formal functions in Rachmaninoff’s piano concertos

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

- 2021 “Cadence as a Hypermetrical Focus,” co-authored with Edward Klorman
Society for Music Theory, poster presentation
- 2021 “Rachmaninoff’s Subdominant.” South-Central Society for Music Theory, virtual
- 2019 “Disguised Cadences in Rachmaninoff’s Songs.”
Society for Music Theory, Columbus, OH

- 2019 “Tonal Pairing in Two of Rachmaninoff’s Songs.”
New England Conference of Music Theorists, Montreal, Canada, and
SotonMAC (Society for Music Analysis, Southampton, UK)
- 2018 “Disguised Cadences in Rachmaninoff’s Songs.”
Music Theory Midwest, London, ON (see also SMT 2019)
- 2018 “Changing Attitudes towards Junior Music Theorists.”
Texas Society for Music Theory, Dallas, TX
- 2017 “Linear-Analytical Elements in Leo Mazel’s Work: Revisiting Chopin’s Fantasy op. 49
Society for Music Theory, Arlington, Virginia
- 2017 “Exploring Linear-Analytical Techniques in the writings of Leo Mazel.”
EuroMAC IX (European Music Analysis Conference), Strasbourg, France
- 2017 “Schenker, Mazel, and Chopin: Elements of Linear Analysis in Mazel.”
Texas Society for Music Theory, Houston, TX, and
Music Theory Society of the Mid-Atlantic, Washington, DC
- 2016 “Non-Monotonicity and Proto-Harmony in Rachmaninoff.”
Society for Music Theory annual meeting, Vancouver, BC
- 2016 “Hypermetrical Shifts and Middleground Harmonic Levels in Mozart.”
MusCan, Calgary, AL (Canadian University Music Society)
- 2016 “Canons as Hypermetrical Transitions in Mozart.”
Texas Society of Music Theory, Belton, TX, and
Music Theory Society of the Mid-Atlantic, University of Pennsylvania
- 2015 “Proto-harmony, Component Keys, and the Problem of Tonal Centricity.”
MusCan, Ottawa (Canadian University Music Society)
- 2014 “Tonal Pairing and the New Russian Choral School.”
EuroMAC VIII, Leuven, Belgium
- 2014 “Tonal Duality in Nineteenth-Century Russian Church Music.”
International Conference on Nineteenth-Century Music, University of Toronto
- 2014 “Tonality and Mutability in Rachmaninoff’s *All-Night Vigil*, Movement 12.”
Music Theory Society of New York State, New York University
- 2013 “The Concept of Mutability in Russian Theory.”
Society of Music Theory annual meeting, Charlotte, NC
- 2011 “Meter and Imitative Texture in Mozart’s String Quartet K. 499.”
Music Graduate Student Conference, Harvard University

- 2010 “Polyphony and Formal Functions in the ‘Haydn’ Quartets of Mozart.”
Music Graduate Student Conference, University of Calgary, AL

OTHER RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS

- 2021 “Elements of Linear Analysis in Russian Theory of Music.” Invited talk at McGill, course on Schenkerian analysis
- 2020 “Rachmaninoff’s Subdominant.” Invited talk at Texas Technical University
- 2019 Informal talk on a Soviet music analysis textbook, Mazel and Zuckerman 1967, comparing concepts to English-language theories of form and rhythm
Invited talk at the **Russian Music Theory Interest group, SMT**
- 2019 Participated in panel discussion “Music Theory and Its Histories” with Thomas Christensen, Frank Heidlberger, Vivek Virani, and Bernardo Illari. UNT CoM
- 2018 A talk on visual elements in Russian theory (Mazel and the *Brigade* Textbook)
Invited talk at the **Russian Music Theory interest group, SMT**
- 2018 “The Cadence as a Hypermetrical Focus.”
Guest lecture at Texas State University, San Marcos
- 2018 “Form-Functional Ambiguity: The Issue of Closure in Performance.”
Blog post, **Performance and Analysis Interest Group, SMT**
- 2017 “Tonal Pairing in Rachmaninoff’s Solo Songs.”
Guest lecture in Prof. Klorman’s class 19th-Century Harmonic techniques
McGill University, Montreal
- 2016 A Workshop on Russian Oktoechos
Yale Department of Music
- 2015 “Yuri Kholopov’s ‘States of Tonality’ (*sostoianiiia tonal’nosti*).”
Invited talk at the **Russian Music Theory interest group, SMT**
- 2015 “Sergei Rachmaninoff’s *All-Night Vigil*, op. 37: a Centenary Celebration.”
CUNY Graduate Center Music Forum (lecture-recital)
- 2015 Edited the Russian theory abstracts for the SMT 2015 program book
Society for Music Theory annual meeting, St. Louis, MO
- 2014 A Bibliography of Russian Textbooks of Music Theory:
Compiled for the **Russian Music Theory interest group, SMT**
https://societymusictheory.org/files/Russian_theory_textbooks_biblio.pdf

TEACHING

2016 **Assistant Professor of Music Theory**

University of North Texas, College of Music

- Courses taught: Graduate Theory Review; 18th-Century Counterpoint; doctoral seminar on Meter in Tonal Music; form analysis; music theory pedagogy; Schenker
- Advise one-semester independent research studies on analysis topics that include: techniques of Schenkerian analysis, Shostakovich, Szymanowski, Brahms, Fauré, Russian folk music, and Russian theories of music
- Advise PhD and DMA dissertations and Master's theses. Currently, **primary adviser** to three PhD students in music theory; serve on other dissertation committees

2015–16 **Lecturer and Coordinator of Musicianship Program**

Yale University, Department of Music

- Taught and coordinated the following courses: Musicianship 1 and 2 (aural skills and keyboard harmony), tonal harmony for non-music majors
- Built a curriculum for the elementary musicianship sequence

2011–15 **Instructor of music theory and ear training**

CUNY Brooklyn College, New York

Courses taught: Schenker (graduate seminar), complete undergraduate theory core (includes Western music from the 18th to the 21st centuries), Ear Training 1, 2, and 3, and Music Appreciation for non-music majors

2014–15 **Writing Tutor**

CUNY Medgar Evers College, New York

2010–11 **Research Assistant**

CUNY Graduate Center, New York

2008–09 **Research Assistant**

McGill University, Montreal

2007–10 **Teaching Assistant, Music Theory**

McGill University, Montreal

Five courses taught: theory core, including Modal Counterpoint, Elementary Harmony, Tonal Harmony and Voice Leading, and Classical Form; Remedial Ear Training 1

2003–04 **Music Theory instructor and interim department chair**

Children's School of Music no. 100, Moscow, Russia

ADVISING – next page

ADVISING

List includes only students who have their projects in progress or completed

- Yiyi Gao **Adviser** PhD theory. **Defended** in September 2021
Atypical Six-Four Chords and their Impact on Middleground Structure
- Amy Hatch **Adviser** PhD theory. In process
Developing Ogolevets's Augmented Prime: The Use of Modal Chromatic Inflection in the Music of Shostakovich and Prokofiev
- Leonardo Zuno **Adviser** PhD theory. In process
Gestures and Form in Beethoven: A Comparative Analysis of the *Missa Solemnis* and the *Emperor Piano Concerto*
- Lerie Delloso **Adviser** MA theory. Defended 2021 (two-paper option)
Liszt's Virtuositic Transformations: Contrasts through Phrase Rhythm and Metrical Dissonance in Transcendental Etude No. 8, "Wilde Jagd"
- David Falterman **Adviser** MA theory. Defended 2019
Two-Dimensional Sonata Form as Methodology: Understanding Sonata-Variation Hybrids through a Two-Dimensional Lens
- Yereum Kim **Co-adviser** DMA piano. Defended 2019
A Performance-and-Analysis Approach to Cadential Ambiguity: Chopin's Piano Sonata No. 2 in B-flat Minor, Op. 35, First Movement
- Alexandra Rouw Committee member MA theory. In process
Project involves Schenkerian analysis of Clara Schumann's songs, op. 13
- Urszula Rucka Committee member DMA harp.
Preparing for her qualifying exams, Spring 2022.
- Jeremy Nowak Committee member PhD theory. In process
Fragments, Ruins, and Witz: Issues of Formal Organization in Robert Schumann's Novelletten, Op.2
- Matthew Bilik Committee member PhD theory. In process
Voice Leading in Fauré's Late Chamber Music: Motivic and Modal Perspectives
- Brian Anderson Committee member PhD musicology. In process
Quantifying Music Binder's Volumes in Nineteenth-Century America: Repertory, Material History, and Metadata
- Chenshayang Huang Committee member DMA piano. Defended in 2020
Let Music Speak Day and Night: A Performance Guide for George Enescu's Impressions D'Enfance for Violin and Piano
- Stephen Hahn Committee member MA theory. Defended 2019

Continuous Harmonic Structure in J.S. Bach's Triple Fugues in the *Well-Tempered Clavier* and *Art of Fugue*

Jason Smith Committee member PhD theory. Defended 2018
Metric Dissonance in Non-Isochronous Meters

Levi Walls Committee member MA theory. Defended 2018
Composing-Out Notre-Dame: How Louise Bertin Expresses the Hugolian Themes of Fate and Decay in *La Esmeralda*

Jennifer Oliver Committee member MA theory. Defended 2018 (two-paper option)

INDEPENDENT STUDIES, COLLOQUIUM COURSES

Ariadna Demkov BM harp performance and theory Spring 2021
Undergraduate colloquium. Paper on Russian folk songs and Russian theory

Steven Heffner MA theory Fall 2020
Special problems course in invertible counterpoint and fugal writing

Lilly Wang MA theory Spring 2020
Special problems course. Paper on expansions in Chopin; Schenkerian analysis

Matthew Bilik PhD theory Fall 2019
Special problems course. Paper on Fauré

Claudia Cop PhD theory Spring 2019
Special problems course. Paper on Szymanowsky

Yiyi Gao PhD theory Fall 2018
Special problems course. Paper on six-four chords in Brahms's First Sonata

Amy Hatch PhD theory Spring 2018
Special problems course. Paper on Shostakovich

Alice Sujana BM theory Fall 2017
Undergraduate colloquium. Paper on Rachmaninoff's *Elegie*, op. 3 no. 1

Hua Xin MA composition Spring 2017
Informal training in Schenkerian analysis

Matildie Thom-Wium Guest scholar, University of the Free State, South Africa. Fall 2016
Informal training in Schenkerian analysis

SERVICE TO THE FIELD OF MUSIC THEORY

2020–22	Chair	Russian Music Theory interest group, SMT Founding member since 2013
2018–21	Member	Committee for Professional Development, SMT
2017 to pres.	Member	Performance and Analysis interest group, SMT Served on the program committee of the group in 2019
2018–21	Member	Texas Society for Music Theory (TSMT), advising board
2017, 2021	Session chair	TSMT annual conference
2018	Session chair	Music Theory Midwest annual conference, London, ON
2013–15	Member	Graduate Students in Music (GSIM) conference program committee. CUNY Graduate Center

Anonymous peer reviewer of articles for the following theory journals:

- Intersections, the Canadian Journal of Music
- Journal of Music Theory
- Music Theory Online (three times)
- Women in Music
- Journal of Schenkerian Studies
- Gamut (journal of the Society for Music Theory of the Mid-Atlantic)
- Reviewed an aural skills book proposal for Oxford University Press, 2019

SERVICE WITHIN THE UNT COLLEGE OF MUSIC

2022	Organizer	Theory Faculty Recital, February 11, 2022
2021 to pres.	Chair	Lecture committee, MHTE division (elected) Member since 2017
2020 to pres.	Member	College of Music Graduate Council (elected)
2017 and 2021	Member	Ad-hoc committee on SCA grants, CoM (appointed)
2021 to pres.	Member	Search committee for a new editor of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies
2019	Chair	Ad-hoc committee for the mission statement, MHTE div
2019–20	Faculty adviser,	Graduate Association of Musicologists <i>and</i> Theorists

2018–19	Secretary	College of Music Faculty (elected)
2017–21	Coordinator	Undergraduate Theory Club (appointed)
2017–18	Member	Search committees: 1) one-year lecturer position 2) assistant professor position
2017–20	Member	Journal of Schenkerian Studies, editorial board
2018	Member	Graduate Academic Degrees Committee, MHTE division
2018–19	Member	Online core theory task force
2016–17	Organizer	Conference paper previews, MHTE division
2017–20	Discussant	GAMuT Faculty panel workshops

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE IN RUSSIA

2003–04	Instructor of music theory and history and interim department chair Children's School of Music no. 100, Moscow
2004	Field trip: folk song collection and recording Kumylga, Volgograd Region
2002	Museum guide (practicum) Museum of Pyort Ilyich Chaikovsky, Klin, Moscow Region
2002	Instructor of music theory (practicum) Children's school attached to the Academic Music College, Moscow

PERFORMANCE EXPERIENCE

Piano:

- Seven years of professional training
- Experience in solo and collaborative performance
- Choir accompanist at Martin Luther German Church, Vancouver, BC (2004)

Choral singing (Montreal, six years), occasional choral conducting (New York)

LANGUAGES: English, French, German (translation skills only), native Russian

Ellen Bakulina

University of North Texas
1155 Union Circle, Denton, TX, USA 76203

Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu
347-527-3785

EDUCATION


- 2015 PhD in Music Theory
CUNY Graduate Center, New York. Adviser: William Rothstein
Dissertation: The Problem of Tonal Disunity in Rachmaninoff's *All Night Vigil*.
- 2010 MA in Music Theory
McGill University, Montreal. Adviser: William Caplin
Thesis: Polyphony as a Loosening Technique in Mozart's "Haydn" quartets
- 2007 Bachelor of Music in Music Theory
McGill University, Montreal
- 2004 Graduate diploma in Music Theory (one year only; left the program in 2004)
Moscow Tchaikovsky Conservatory, Moscow, Russia
- 2003 Diploma *cum laude* in Music Theory, Music History, and Pedagogy
Academic Music College of the Moscow Tchaikovsky Conservatory, Russia

EMPLOYMENT

- 2016 to present University of North Texas,
Assistant Professor
- 2015–16 Yale University Department of Music
Lecturer and coordinator of the undergraduate musicianship program,
levels 1 and 2
- 2011–15 Brooklyn College, City University of New York
Instructor (Graduate Teaching Fellow and later Adjunct Professor)
- 2007–10 Schulich School of Music, McGill University
Teaching Assistant with classroom teaching duties

GRANTS AND AWARDS

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| - Enhanced Chancellor's Fellowship, CUNY | 2010 to 2015 |
| - SSHRC (Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada) Doctoral Fellowship | 2011 to 2014 |
| - Graduate Teaching Award, McGill | 2009 |
| - Schulich Scholarship, McGill | 2008 |
| - Sara Berlind Memorial Scholarship, McGill | 2007 and 2008 |



PUBLICATIONS

- 2021 “The Loosening of Closure: A Form-Functional Study of Rachmaninoff’s Solo Songs.” Forthcoming in *Theory and Practice* 45. Peer-reviewed
- 2020 “The Brigade Textbook: Disseminating the Riemannian Legacy in the Russian-Soviet Theoretical Tradition.” *Theoria* 26: 85–111. Reviewed by the editor
2020. Introduction to Russian Music Theory Panel, SMT 2018: “Theories of Harmonic Function in Russia: an Introduction to Three Essays.” *Theoria* 26: 55–60.
- 2020 “Tonal Pairing in Two of Rachmaninoff’s Songs.” In *Analytical Approaches to Russian Music*, edited by Inessa Bazayev and Chris Segall. Routledge. Peer-reviewed
- 2018 “Proto-harmony in Rachmaninoff’s sacred music.” *Intégral* 32, 15–36. Peer-reviewed
- 2017 “Canons as Hypermetrical Transitions in Mozart.” *Music Theory Online* 23.4.2. Peer-reviewed
- 2015 “Tonality and Mutability in Rachmaninoff’s *All-Night Vigil*, Movement 12.” *Journal of Music Theory* 59/1: 63–97. Peer-reviewed
- 2014 “The Concept of Mutability in Russian Theory.” *Music Theory Online* 20.3.5. Peer-reviewed by SMT program committee 2013 and by MTO editor
- 2012 “The Loosening Role of Polyphony: Texture and Formal Functions in Mozart’s ‘Haydn’ Quartets.” *Intersections*, the Canadian Journal of Music 32/2: 7–42. Peer-reviewed

IN PROGRESS:

“Leo Mazel and Linear Analysis: Revisiting Chopin’s Fantasy op. 49.” Submitted to MTO

Book project in progress: formal functions in Rachmaninoff’s piano concertos

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

- 2021 “Cadence as a Hypermetrical Focus,” co-authored with Edward Klorman **Society for Music Theory**, poster presentation
- 2021 “Rachmaninoff’s Subdominant.” South-Central Society for Music Theory, virtual
- 2019 “Disguised Cadences in Rachmaninoff’s Songs.” **Society for Music Theory**, Columbus, OH

- 2019 “Tonal Pairing in Two of Rachmaninoff’s Songs.”
New England Conference of Music Theorists, Montreal, Canada, and
SotonMAC (Society for Music Analysis, Southampton, UK)
- 2018 “Disguised Cadences in Rachmaninoff’s Songs.”
Music Theory Midwest, London, ON (see also SMT 2019)
- 2018 “Changing Attitudes towards Junior Music Theorists.”
Texas Society for Music Theory, Dallas, TX
- 2017 “Linear-Analytical Elements in Leo Mazel’s Work: Revisiting Chopin’s Fantasy op. 49
Society for Music Theory, Arlington, Virginia
- 2017 “Exploring Linear-Analytical Techniques in the writings of Leo Mazel.”
EuroMAC IX (European Music Analysis Conference), Strasbourg, France
- 2017 “Schenker, Mazel, and Chopin: Elements of Linear Analysis in Mazel.”
Texas Society for Music Theory, Houston, TX, and
Music Theory Society of the Mid-Atlantic, Washington, DC
- 2016 “Non-Monotonicity and Proto-Harmony in Rachmaninoff.”
Society for Music Theory annual meeting, Vancouver, BC
- 2016 “Hypermetrical Shifts and Middleground Harmonic Levels in Mozart.”
MusCan, Calgary, AL (Canadian University Music Society)
- 2016 “Canons as Hypermetrical Transitions in Mozart.”
Texas Society of Music Theory, Belton, TX, and
Music Theory Society of the Mid-Atlantic, University of Pennsylvania
- 2015 “Proto-harmony, Component Keys, and the Problem of Tonal Centricity.”
MusCan, Ottawa (Canadian University Music Society)
- 2014 “Tonal Pairing and the New Russian Choral School.”
EuroMAC VIII, Leuven, Belgium
- 2014 “Tonal Duality in Nineteenth-Century Russian Church Music.”
International Conference on Nineteenth-Century Music, University of Toronto
- 2014 “Tonality and Mutability in Rachmaninoff’s *All-Night Vigil*, Movement 12.”
Music Theory Society of New York State, New York University
- 2013 “The Concept of Mutability in Russian Theory.”
Society of Music Theory annual meeting, Charlotte, NC
- 2011 “Meter and Imitative Texture in Mozart’s String Quartet K. 499.”
Music Graduate Student Conference, Harvard University

- 2010 “Polyphony and Formal Functions in the ‘Haydn’ Quartets of Mozart.”
Music Graduate Student Conference, University of Calgary, AL

OTHER RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS

- 2021 “Elements of Linear Analysis in Russian Theory of Music.” Invited talk at McGill, course on Schenkerian analysis
- 2020 “Rachmaninoff’s Subdominant.” Invited talk at Texas Technical University
- 2019 Informal talk on a Soviet music analysis textbook, Mazel and Zuckerman 1967, comparing concepts to English-language theories of form and rhythm
Invited talk at the **Russian Music Theory Interest group, SMT**
- 2019 Participated in panel discussion “Music Theory and Its Histories” with Thomas Christensen, Frank Heidlberger, Vivek Virani, and Bernardo Illari. UNT CoM
- 2018 A talk on visual elements in Russian theory (Mazel and the *Brigade* Textbook)
Invited talk at the **Russian Music Theory interest group, SMT**
- 2018 “The Cadence as a Hypermetrical Focus.”
Guest lecture at Texas State University, San Marcos
- 2018 “Form-Functional Ambiguity: The Issue of Closure in Performance.”
Blog post, **Performance and Analysis Interest Group, SMT**
- 2017 “Tonal Pairing in Rachmaninoff’s Solo Songs.”
Guest lecture in Prof. Klorman’s class 19th-Century Harmonic techniques
McGill University, Montreal
- 2016 A Workshop on Russian Oktoechos
Yale Department of Music
- 2015 “Yuri Kholopov’s ‘States of Tonality’ (*sostoianiiia tonal’nosti*).”
Invited talk at the **Russian Music Theory interest group, SMT**
- 2015 “Sergei Rachmaninoff’s *All-Night Vigil*, op. 37: a Centenary Celebration.”
CUNY Graduate Center Music Forum (lecture-recital)
- 2015 Edited the Russian theory abstracts for the SMT 2015 program book
Society for Music Theory annual meeting, St. Louis, MO
- 2014 A Bibliography of Russian Textbooks of Music Theory:
Compiled for the **Russian Music Theory interest group, SMT**
https://societymusictheory.org/files/Russian_theory_textbooks_biblio.pdf

TEACHING

2016 **Assistant Professor of Music Theory**

University of North Texas, College of Music

- Courses taught: Graduate Theory Review; 18th-Century Counterpoint; doctoral seminar on Meter in Tonal Music; form analysis; music theory pedagogy; Schenker
- Advise one-semester independent research studies on analysis topics that include: techniques of Schenkerian analysis, Shostakovich, Szymanowski, Brahms, Fauré, Russian folk music, and Russian theories of music
- Advise PhD and DMA dissertations and Master's theses. Currently, **primary adviser** to three PhD students in music theory; serve on other dissertation committees

2015–16 **Lecturer and Coordinator of Musicianship Program**

Yale University, Department of Music

- Taught and coordinated the following courses: Musicianship 1 and 2 (aural skills and keyboard harmony), tonal harmony for non-music majors
- Built a curriculum for the elementary musicianship sequence

2011–15 **Instructor of music theory and ear training**

CUNY Brooklyn College, New York

Courses taught: Schenker (graduate seminar), complete undergraduate theory core (includes Western music from the 18th to the 21st centuries), Ear Training 1, 2, and 3, and Music Appreciation for non-music majors

2014–15 **Writing Tutor**

CUNY Medgar Evers College, New York

2010–11 **Research Assistant**

CUNY Graduate Center, New York

2008–09 **Research Assistant**

McGill University, Montreal

2007–10 **Teaching Assistant, Music Theory**

McGill University, Montreal

Five courses taught: theory core, including Modal Counterpoint, Elementary Harmony, Tonal Harmony and Voice Leading, and Classical Form; Remedial Ear Training 1

2003–04 **Music Theory instructor and interim department chair**

Children's School of Music no. 100, Moscow, Russia

ADVISING – next page

ADVISING

List includes only students who have their projects in progress or completed

- Yiyi Gao **Adviser** PhD theory. **Defended** in September 2021
Atypical Six-Four Chords and their Impact on Middleground Structure
- Amy Hatch **Adviser** PhD theory. In process
Developing Ogolevets's Augmented Prime: The Use of Modal Chromatic Inflection in the Music of Shostakovich and Prokofiev
- Leonardo Zuno **Adviser** PhD theory. In process
Gestures and Form in Beethoven: A Comparative Analysis of the *Missa Solemnis* and the *Emperor Piano Concerto*
- Lerie Dellosa **Adviser** MA theory. Defended 2021 (two-paper option)
Liszt's Virtuositic Transformations: Contrasts through Phrase Rhythm and Metrical Dissonance in Transcendental Etude No. 8, "Wilde Jagd"
- David Falterman **Adviser** MA theory. Defended 2019
Two-Dimensional Sonata Form as Methodology: Understanding Sonata-Variation Hybrids through a Two-Dimensional Lens
- Yereum Kim **Co-adviser** DMA piano. Defended 2019
A Performance-and-Analysis Approach to Cadential Ambiguity: Chopin's Piano Sonata No. 2 in B-flat Minor, Op. 35, First Movement
- Alexandra Rouw Committee member MA theory. In process
Project involves Schenkerian analysis of Clara Schumann's songs, op. 13
- Urszula Rucka Committee member DMA harp.
Preparing for her qualifying exams, Spring 2022.
- Jeremy Nowak Committee member PhD theory. In process
Fragments, Ruins, and Witz: Issues of Formal Organization in Robert Schumann's Novelletten, Op.2
- Matthew Bilik Committee member PhD theory. In process
Voice Leading in Fauré's Late Chamber Music: Motivic and Modal Perspectives
- Brian Anderson Committee member PhD musicology. In process
Quantifying Music Binder's Volumes in Nineteenth-Century America: Repertory, Material History, and Metadata
- Chenshayang Huang Committee member DMA piano. Defended in 2020
Let Music Speak Day and Night: A Performance Guide for George Enescu's Impressions D'Enfance for Violin and Piano
- Stephen Hahn Committee member MA theory. Defended 2019

Continuous Harmonic Structure in J.S. Bach's Triple Fugues in the *Well-Tempered Clavier* and *Art of Fugue*

Jason Smith Committee member PhD theory. Defended 2018
Metric Dissonance in Non-Isochronous Meters

Levi Walls Committee member MA theory. Defended 2018
Composing-Out Notre-Dame: How Louise Bertin Expresses the Hugolian Themes of Fate and Decay in *La Esmeralda*

Jennifer Oliver Committee member MA theory. Defended 2018 (two-paper option)

INDEPENDENT STUDIES, COLLOQUIUM COURSES

Ariadna Demkov BM harp performance and theory Spring 2021
Undergraduate colloquium. Paper on Russian folk songs and Russian theory

Steven Heffner MA theory Fall 2020
Special problems course in invertible counterpoint and fugal writing

Lilly Wang MA theory Spring 2020
Special problems course. Paper on expansions in Chopin; Schenkerian analysis

Matthew Bilik PhD theory Fall 2019
Special problems course. Paper on Fauré

Claudia Cop PhD theory Spring 2019
Special problems course. Paper on Szymanowsky

Yiyi Gao PhD theory Fall 2018
Special problems course. Paper on six-four chords in Brahms's First Sonata

Amy Hatch PhD theory Spring 2018
Special problems course. Paper on Shostakovich

Alice Sujana BM theory Fall 2017
Undergraduate colloquium. Paper on Rachmaninoff's *Elegie*, op. 3 no. 1

Hua Xin MA composition Spring 2017
Informal training in Schenkerian analysis

Matildie Thom-Wium Guest scholar, University of the Free State, South Africa. Fall 2016
Informal training in Schenkerian analysis

SERVICE TO THE FIELD OF MUSIC THEORY

2020–22	Chair	Russian Music Theory interest group, SMT Founding member since 2013
2018–21	Member	Committee for Professional Development, SMT
2017 to pres.	Member	Performance and Analysis interest group, SMT Served on the program committee of the group in 2019
2018–21	Member	Texas Society for Music Theory (TSMT), advising board
2017, 2021	Session chair	TSMT annual conference
2018	Session chair	Music Theory Midwest annual conference, London, ON
2013–15	Member	Graduate Students in Music (GSIM) conference program committee. CUNY Graduate Center

Anonymous peer reviewer of articles for the following theory journals:

- Intersections, the Canadian Journal of Music
- Journal of Music Theory
- Music Theory Online (three times)
- Women in Music
- Journal of Schenkerian Studies
- Gamut (journal of the Society for Music Theory of the Mid-Atlantic)
- Reviewed an aural skills book proposal for Oxford University Press, 2019

SERVICE WITHIN THE UNT COLLEGE OF MUSIC

2022	Organizer	Theory Faculty Recital, February 11, 2022
2021 to pres.	Chair	Lecture committee, MHTE division (elected) Member since 2017
2020 to pres.	Member	College of Music Graduate Council (elected)
2017 and 2021	Member	Ad-hoc committee on SCA grants, CoM (appointed)
2021 to pres.	Member	Search committee for a new editor of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies
2019	Chair	Ad-hoc committee for the mission statement, MHTE div
2019–20	Faculty adviser,	Graduate Association of Musicologists <i>and</i> Theorists

2018–19	Secretary	College of Music Faculty (elected)
2017–21	Coordinator	Undergraduate Theory Club (appointed)
2017–18	Member	Search committees: 1) one-year lecturer position 2) assistant professor position
2017–20	Member	Journal of Schenkerian Studies, editorial board
2018	Member	Graduate Academic Degrees Committee, MHTE division
2018–19	Member	Online core theory task force
2016–17	Organizer	Conference paper previews, MHTE division
2017–20	Discussant	GAMuT Faculty panel workshops

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE IN RUSSIA

2003–04	Instructor of music theory and history and interim department chair Children's School of Music no. 100, Moscow
2004	Field trip: folk song collection and recording Kumylga, Volgograd Region
2002	Museum guide (practicum) Museum of Pyort Ilyich Chaikovsky, Klin, Moscow Region
2002	Instructor of music theory (practicum) Children's school attached to the Academic Music College, Moscow

PERFORMANCE EXPERIENCE

Piano:

- Seven years of professional training
- Experience in solo and collaborative performance
- Choir accompanist at Martin Luther German Church, Vancouver, BC (2004)

Choral singing (Montreal, six years), occasional choral conducting (New York)

LANGUAGES: English, French, German (translation skills only), native Russian

THEORIA

Historical Aspects of Music Theory

VOLUME 26 – 2020

EDITOR

Frank Heidlberger

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Matthew Bilik

ADVISORY BOARD

Kyle Adams
Thomas Christensen
Kevin Korsyn
Harald Krebs
Joel Lester

Timothy McKinney
William Pastille
Wayne Petty
Janna Saslaw
Robert Wason

Theoria is published annually by the University of North Texas Press

Denton, TX 76203

ISSN 1554-1312

BAKULINA

EXHIBIT

4

Kim Carrell, CSR

Oct 16, 2024

THEORIA

Historical Aspects of Music Theory

VOLUME 26 – 2020

ARTICLES

Chun-Yan Tse

Erroneous Discourses on Tuning Theories between China and
the West: The Kangxi 14-tone System 5

Caleb Mutch

Pedagogy and Authority in Sixteenth-Century German Music
Theory Textbooks 25

Russian Music Theory Panel, SMT 2018

Ellen Bakulina

Theories of Harmonic Function in Russia: An Introduction
to Three Essays 55

Philip Ewell

Harmonic Functionalism in Russian Music Theory: A Primer 61

Ellen Bakulina

The “Brigade Textbook:” Disseminating the Riemannian Legacy in the
Russian-Soviet Theoretical Tradition 85

Christopher Segall

Expanding Harmonic Function: Yuri Kholopov’s Twelve-Step System 113

Directions to Contributors

Any submissions that match the special field of this journal are welcome. *Theoria* accepts articles (studies, essays) on the following topics:

- The entire field of the history of Western Music Theory of any time period, including interdisciplinary studies
- Aspects of influence or interrelationships between Non-Western Music Theory and Western Music Theory
- Commented editions and translations of hardly accessible or yet unpublished source texts on Music Theory or on topics related to Music Theory
- Analytical studies of music of any time period that apply or critically discuss new methods of analysis
- Review articles of books related to the history of Music Theory and Analysis.

All submissions will be peer reviewed for their scholarly quality, clarity and originality. Only high-level professional research materials will be considered. PhD candidates and junior faculty in the related disciplines are particularly encouraged to submit articles.

First send an abstract (300 words max.) and a short biographical information by e-mail. If this is accepted, you will be asked to submit your text. It must be the final and complete text ready for publication, sent as Word or pdf-file, including all music examples, illustrations, tables as applicable. For article formatting guidelines, see: <https://mhtr.music.unt.edu/theoria/call-articles>. Please send all submissions and editorial inquiries by e-mail to the editor, Frank Heidlberger: heidlberger@unt.edu

Dr. Frank Heidlberger

Editor *Theoria*

University of North Texas

1155, Union Circle #311367

Denton, TX 76203-1367

ABOUT MUSIC THEORY SPECTRUM

A leading journal in the field and an official publication of the Society for Music Theory, Music Theory Spectrum features articles on a wide range of topics in music theory and analysis, including aesthetics, critical theory and hermeneutics, history of theory, post-tonal theory, linear analysis, rhythm, music cognition, and the analysis of popular musics. The journal welcomes interdisciplinary articles revealing intersections with topics in other fields such as ethnomusicology, mathematics, musicology, philosophy, psychology, and performance.

- SMT members who wish online access to the latest issue of Music Theory Spectrum, as well as to past issues, should log in to their profile (<https://members.societymusictheory.org/general/custom.asp?page=member-benefits>) to access a link to view the publication online. Members will also find a link to Spectrum under "Quick links" after logging into their profile.
- Those who are not current members of SMT may purchase access to individual issues or articles on the Oxford Journals website (<http://www.oxfordjournals.org>), or else may join SMT (<https://societymusictheory.org/membership>) to gain access to the current and all past issues.

First contact for authors is Peter Smith, Editor (<mailto:mts-editor@societymusictheory.org>). Review copies can be sent to Karen Fournier, Reviews Editor (<mailto:kjfourni@umich.edu>).

Music Theory Spectrum offers a range of digital and print advertising options. Please contact Linda Hann (linda.hann@oup.com (<mailto:linda.hann@oup.com>)) for more details.

The expectations are that all reviews for SMT publications will be respectful, constructive, expert, and timely. Because referees often serve as mentors for less experienced scholars, it is paramount that readers avoid tone and language that is condescending, sarcastic, pejorative, bullying, or uncivil.

EDITORIAL BOARD

EDITOR

✉ Peter Smith (outgoing)
Laura Emmerly (incoming) (<mailto:mts-editor@societymusictheory.org>)

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Outgoing:
Lori Burns
Laura Emmerly
Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers

Incoming:
Michael Callahan
Benjamin Levy
Victoria Malawey

REVIEWS EDITOR

Karen Fournier

MANAGING EDITOR


Matthew Ferrandino

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Outgoing:
Ryan Blakeley
Noah Kahrs
Sylvain Margot

BOARD MEMBERS

Kofi Agawu
Alyssa Barna
Gurminder Bhogal
Nicole Biamonte
Jonathan Guez
Patricia Hall
Robert Hatten
Andrew Hicks
Julian Horton
John Koslovsky
Brian Moseley
Christoph Neidhöfer
Carmel Raz
Braxton Shelley
Benedict Taylor
Yayoi Uno Everett



Instructions to Authors

Information for Contributors

The Publications Committee of the Society for Music Theory welcomes submissions to *Music Theory Spectrum* on a broad range of subjects within the discipline of music theory. Authors are urged to make sure their manuscript submissions meet the following criteria:

- Manuscripts should be of moderate length (5,000–10,000 words) and include musical examples, tables, and other artwork only to the extent necessary.
- *Music Theory Spectrum* practices blind review. For this reason, authors should avoid identifying themselves, directly or indirectly, in the submission itself, confining such identification to an accompanying cover letter.
- The Society for Music Theory has endorsed the principle that language that treats both sexes equally should characterize all its publications. [Guidelines for Non-Sexist Language](#) are available online.

Manuscripts should be written in normal scholarly style and form as outlined in the 16th edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. *Music Theory Spectrum* uses the author–date system of documentation outlined in Chapter 16 of the Manual. All manuscripts must be submitted via [the online submission system](#).

Article submissions should include the following in electronic format only:

- Please submit your article as a single .pdf file with all examples included, either embedded in the body of the text or collected as a separate section. Make sure all examples are labeled and captioned appropriately.
- Manuscripts accepted for adjudication should be in 12–point font, spaced at either 1 or two lines (including footnotes and quotations), and provided with footnotes instead of endnotes. Footnotes should be 12–point type;
- Musical examples, figures, tables, and other artwork, all clearly identified as numbered examples. Please note that we prefer audio files in mp4 format;
- An abstract of 25–100 words, suitable for publication.

Figure accessibility and alt text

Incorporating alt text (alternative text) when submitting your paper helps to foster inclusivity and accessibility. Good alt text ensures that individuals with visual impairments or those using screen readers can comprehend the content and context of your figures. The aim of alt text is to provide concise and informative descriptions of your figure so that all readers have access to the same level of information and understanding, and that all can engage with and benefit from the visual elements integral to scholarly content. Including alt text demonstrates a commitment to accessibility and enhances the overall impact and reach of your work.

OXFORD

Join the conversation and connect with the latest music research



FOLLOW @OUPMUSIC ON TWITTER

Advertisement

Latest	Most Read	Most Cited
Meter as RhythmMusic in Time: Phenomenology, Perception, Performance		
Performing It: Gesture and Timbre in Fujikura Dai's neo for Solo Shamisen		
Closed, Closing, and Close to Closure: The Nineteenth-Century "Closing Theme" Problem as Exemplified in Mendelssohn's Sonata Practice		
Lines and Lyrics: An Introduction to Poetry and Song		
Narrative and Tonal Structure in Hermann's Score for Vertigo		

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

LEARN MORE ABOUT
OPEN ACCESS

Alt text is only accessible via e-reader and so it won't appear as part of the typeset article.

[Detailed guidance on how to draft and submit alt text.](#)

Should an article be accepted for publication, authors will be requested to prepare manuscripts for editing using formatting guidelines slightly different from those outlined above. Instructions will be included with the letter of acceptance. All manuscripts accepted for publication become the sole property of the [Society for Music Theory, Inc.](#)

Open access option for authors

Music Theory Spectrum authors have the option to publish their paper under the [Oxford Open initiative](#); whereby, for a charge, their paper will be made freely available online immediately upon publication. After your manuscript is accepted the corresponding author will be required to accept a mandatory licence to publish agreement. As part of the licensing process you will be asked to indicate whether or not you wish to pay for open access. If you do not select the open access option, your paper will be published with standard subscription-based access and you will not be charged.

Oxford Open articles are published under Creative Commons licences. Authors publishing in *Music Theory Spectrum* can use the following Creative Commons licences for their articles:

- Creative Commons licence (CC BY)
- Creative Commons Non-Commercial licence (CC BY-NC)

Visit the OUP licensing website to find out more about [Creative Commons licences](#).

Regular charge – \$3,940

Third-party content in open access papers

If you will be publishing your paper under an Open Access licence but it contains material for which you *do not* have Open Access re-use permissions, please state this clearly by supplying the following credit line alongside the material:

Title of content

Author, Original publication, year of original publication, by permission of [rights holder]

This image/content is not covered by the terms of the Creative Commons licence of this publication. For permission to reuse, please contact the rights holder.

Author Toll Free Link and Discounts

All corresponding authors will be provided with a free access link to their article upon publication. The link will be sent via email to the article's corresponding author who is free

Oxford University Press uses cookies to enhance your experience on our website. By selecting 'accept all' you are agreeing cookies. You can change your cookie settings at any time. More information can be found in our [Cookie Policy](#).


All authors have the option to purchase up to 10 print copies of the issue in which they publish at a 50% discount. Orders should be placed through this [order form](#). Orders must be made within 12 months of the online publication date.

Any problems with submission or additional correspondence should be sent to:

Laura Emmery, Editor
laura.emmery@gmail.com
Music Theory Spectrum
Emory University

Books for review should be sent to:

Karen Fournier, Reviews Editor
kjfourni@umich.edu
Music Theory Spectrum
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor



Advertisement

Latest	Most Read	Most Cited
Meter as RhythmMusic in Time: Phenomenology, Perception, Performance		
Performing Te: Gesture and Timbre in Fujikura Dai's <i>neo</i> for Solo Shamisen		
Closed, Closing, and Close to Closure: The Nineteenth-Century "Closing Theme" Problem as Exemplified in Mendelssohn's Sonata Practice		
Lines and Lyrics: An Introduction to Poetry and Song		
Narrative and Tonal Structure in		

Oxford University Press uses cookies to enhance your experience on our website. By selecting 'accept all' you are agreeing cookies. You can change your cookie settings at any time. More information can be found in our [Cookie Policy](#).

Music Theory Spectrum

THE JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR MUSIC THEORY

VOLUME XLIII, NO. 2—FALL 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IAN SEWELL	197	When All You Have is a Hammer: Surface/Depth as Good Comparison
BEN DUINKER	221	Segmentation, Phrasing, and Meter in Hip-Hop Music
CARA STROUD	246	Webs of Meaning in John Corigliano's Tarantellas
CHRISTOPHER BRODY	257	Second-Reprise Opening Schemas in Bach's Binary Movements
RAM REUVEN	280	Undersurface Sequences
JULIAN HORTON	299	Rethinking Sonata Failure: Mendelssohn's Overture <i>Zum Märchen von der schönen Melusine</i>
COLLOQUY		REFRAMING MUSIC THEORY
ELIZABETH WEST		
MARVIN	320	Naming the Frames that Shape Us
PHILIP EWELL	324	Music Theory's White Racial Frame
YAYOI U. EVERETT	330	From Exoticism to Interculturalism: Counterframing the East–West Binary
JOSEPH STRAUS	339	Music Theory's Therapeutic Imperative and the Tyranny of the Normal
ELLIE M. HISAMA	349	Getting to Count
REVIEWS	364	<i>Voice Leading: The Science Behind a Musical Art</i> . By David Huron. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2016, vii + 263 pages. Reviewed by Morwaread M. Farbood
	370	<i>Composing the World: Harmony in the Medieval Platonic Cosmos</i> . By Andrew Hicks. Critical Conjunctures in Music and Sound. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2017, xix + 321 pages. Reviewed by Jessica Fulkerson
	376	Erratum
	377	Contributors

Music Theory's White Racial Frame

PHILIP EWELL

For over twenty years, music theory has tried to diversify with respect to race, yet the field today remains remarkably white, not only in the people who practice music theory but also in the race of the composers and theorists whose work music theory privileges. In this article, I offer a few explanations for why this is so. I posit a music-theoretical “white racial frame” that is structural and institutionalized, and argue that only through a deframing and reframing of this white racial frame will we begin to see positive racial changes in music theory.

Keywords: race, whiteness, critical-race studies, music theory, white racial frame.

Not everything that is faced can be changed, but nothing can be changed until it is faced.¹

Music theory is white. According to the Society for Music Theory, roughly 84% of the society's membership, 90% of full-time employees, and 94% of associate and full professors are white.² Aside from this literal version, there is an even more deep-seated figurative whiteness that manifests itself in the composers and music theorists we choose to study. Thus, for example, I am a black person—the only associate professor who self-identified as such in the Society for Music Theory (SMT) demographic report³—but I am also a practitioner of what I sometimes call “white music theory.”

In 1995, the SMT formed the Diversity Committee to “increase the ethnic diversity of the membership of the society.”⁴ In 1996, President Joe Straus set the goal to “diversify our membership,” noting that, of current members, “fewer than 2% are African American or Hispanic.”⁵ In 2018, that number had increased to only 2.9%.⁶ Thus, for over twenty-two years, SMT has tried to increase racial diversity by, for example, forming committees to address demographic issues; providing grant monies targeting racial minorities; and instituting programs for mentoring persons of color. Despite our efforts, we have failed.

In this article I argue for a fundamentally different approach to music theory's literal and figurative whiteness. I draw on the antiracist work of race scholars and concepts like the “white racial frame,” “racialized structures,” and “colorblind racism.” I ultimately argue for a restructuring of our racialized

structures—a *deframing* and *reframing* of the white racial frame—in hopes of achieving true racial diversity.

In various works, sociologist Joe Feagin explains how a white racial frame has emerged in the United States that “was generated to rationalize and insure white privilege and dominance over Americans of color.”⁷ I posit that this white racial frame is very much active today in music theory. Here is his definition of the white racial frame:

An overarching white worldview that encompasses a *broad and persisting set of racial stereotypes, prejudices, ideologies, images, interpretations and narratives, emotions, and reactions to language accents, as well as racialized inclinations to discriminate*.⁸

With respect to music theory, I stress not so much negative nonwhite racial stereotypes as *positive white stereotypes* or, as Feagin calls it, a “pro-white subframe,”⁹ which is fundamental to music theory and which also spurs a “racialized inclination to discriminate.” Perhaps the most important role of this framing is to keep the system as it is. Feagin states, “One function of the white frame is to justify the great array of privileges and assets held by white Americans as the group at the top of the racial hierarchy.”¹⁰ White persons have held all the power in music theory—music theory's white racial frame entrenches and institutionalizes that power.

Sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva defines “racial structure” in the following quotation:

When race emerged... racialized social systems, or white supremacy for short, became global and affected all societies where Europeans extended their reach. I therefore conceive a society's racial structure as *the totality of the social relations and practices that reinforce white privilege*... Therein lies the secret of racial structures and racial inequality the world over. They exist because they benefit members of the dominant race.¹¹

This article is a transcript of my 2019 Society for Music Theory Plenary Paper, “Music Theory's White Racial Frame.” Aside from adding bibliographic citations, I have adjusted the text as minimally as possible. For a more complete version of this article, see [Ewell \(2020\)](#).

¹ Baldwin (1962).

² Brown (2018).

³ Ibid.

⁴ Hall (1996, 7).

⁵ Straus (1996, 2).

⁶ Brown (2018).

⁷ Feagin ([2009] 2013, x).

⁸ Ibid., 3.

⁹ Ibid., 10.

¹⁰ Ibid., 146.

Many of our musical-theoretical institutions are, in fact, such racial structures.

The final important term from Bonilla-Silva is “colorblind racism,” the most significant form of racism in our white racial frame:

The elements that comprise [colorblind racism] are the increasingly covert nature of racial discourse and racial practices; the avoidance of racial terminology and the ever-growing claim by whites that they experience ‘reverse racism’...; [and] the invisibility of most mechanisms to reproduce racial inequality.¹²

“What does music theory have to do with race?” has been a common music-theoretical colorblind refrain, which accomplishes two goals: it allows the white-frame theorist to appear to be on the correct side of racism, while allowing the very same racialized structures put in place to “benefit members of the dominant [white] race,” to remain foundational. Also note the “avoidance of racial terminology,” especially the terms “white” and “whiteness,” which has been a primary driver behind the neoliberal language of diversity, which I touch on briefly below.

In order to debunk the many mythologies of music theory’s white racial frame, we must confront its core beliefs head on. Our white racial frame believes that:

- the music and music theories of white persons represent the best framework for music theory.
- among these white persons, the music and music theories of whites from German-speaking lands of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early-twentieth centuries represent the pinnacle of music-theoretical thought.
- the institutions and structures of music theory have little or nothing to do with race or whiteness, and that to critically examine race and whiteness in music theory would be unfair or inappropriate.
- the language of “diversity” and the actions it effects will rectify racial disparities, and therefore racial injustices, in music theory.

I analyzed the seven most widely used theory textbooks in the United States in order to cull racial data on the composers represented and the market share of the textbooks—overwhelmingly, the music chosen to represent music theory was written by white persons.¹³ Example 1 shows that, of 2930 musical examples in all seven textbooks, 49 were written by nonwhites. This represents 1.67% of the musical examples from all textbooks, which account for roughly 96% of the market share.

¹¹ Bonilla-Silva ([2003] 2018, 8–9).

¹² Ibid., 18.

¹³ With thanks to Megan Lyons for researching, compiling, and helping to interpret the demographic data, and to Justin Hoffman of Oxford University Press for providing unofficial statistics on textbook market share.

By comparison, once we realized that there were virtually no female composers in our music-theory textbooks, we began to include them. Similarly, the first solution we will think of to solve the racial imbalance will be to find examples by black composers. But stocking our textbooks with such examples is not the solution to this problem, which is a result of framing western functional tonality as the only organizational force in music worthy of music theory’s consideration in the classroom. As the main musical organizational force that emerged from Europe in the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, functional tonality is also racialized as “white,” and a key element of Bonilla-Silva’s racial structure, which again is “the totality of the social relations and practices that reinforce white privilege.”¹⁴ Thus, our curricular problem concerns not only the repertoire we study, but the music theories behind the repertoire. This distinction between “white repertoire” and “white theory” is of vital importance since our white frame can only envision one, that is, expanding the repertoire to include non-white composers, and not the other, studying nonwestern/nonwhite music theory.

Lest you think I somehow wish to implicate only whiteness, I would like to mention a person of color who was more committed to white racial framing than anyone I know, my father, John Ewell, who died in 2007. John only valued the West, and he often disparaged non-Western cultures and societies. John, who graduated from Morehouse College in 1948 with Martin Luther King, ultimately got a Ph.D. in number theory from UCLA as an advisee of Ernst Straus, himself a former advisee and assistant of Albert Einstein. John’s heroes were mathematicians such as Leonhard Euler, Carl Friedrich Gauss, and Pierre de Fermat, or composers such as Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Giuseppe Verdi, and Sergei Rachmaninov. John raised me to worship western cultures, their arts, music, languages, and philosophies, though at a fairly early age I knew his beliefs were suspect. I include the story about my father only to highlight just how pervasive white racial framing is. I know with certainty that my black father would have vehemently denied that his beliefs could have in any way been associated with the white supremacy that inheres in America’s white racial frame. Much to my disappointment, he was wrong.

The best example through which to understand our white frame is Heinrich Schenker, a fervent racist whose racism undoubtedly influenced his music theories yet gets whitewashed for general consumption. It would be hard to overstate Heinrich Schenker’s influence on American music theory. Whether one specifically studies Schenker and Schenkerian analysis, tonal music generally, popular music, or post-tonal topics, Schenker in many ways represents our shared model of what it means to be a music theorist. If Beethoven is our exemplar for a music composer, Schenker is our exemplar for a music theorist. After all, his is the only named music theory routinely required across top music theory graduate programs.

¹⁴ Bonilla-Silva ([2003] 2018, 8).

Textbook	Percentage of market share	Total number of examples	Number of examples by nonwhites	Percentage of examples by nonwhites
Aldwell and Schachter, 4 th ed. (2011)	5	465	0	0%
Benward and Saker, 9 th ed. (2015)	13	333	8	2.40%
Burstein and Straus, 1 st ed. (2016)	11	304	1	0.33%
Clendinning and Marvin 3 rd ed. (2016)	25	504	15	2.98%
Kostka, Payne, and Almén, 8 th ed. (2018)	29	370	10	2.70%
Laitz, 4 th ed. (2015)	8	550	2	0.36%
Roig-Francoli, 2 nd ed. (2010)	5	404	13	3.22%
TOTALS	96	2930	49	1.67%

EXAMPLE 1. *Racial demographic data for musical examples from seven American music theory textbooks*

In his voluminous writings, Schenker often mentions race and the terms “white” and “black” as modifiers for human races. He speaks of “less able or more primitive races,”¹⁵ “inferior races,”¹⁶ and “wild and half-wild people.”¹⁷ He speaks of whiteness in relation to the “animal” Japanese, that the “white race” will need to adapt in order to “annihilate” the Japanese “animals.”¹⁸ On Slavs, Schenker poured more scorn, writing about the “Slavic half-breed,” that the Germans must crush them on grounds of superiority.¹⁹

About blacks Schenker had the lowest of opinions. When speaking about self-governance, Schenker says in disbelief, “even negroes proclaim that they want to govern themselves because they, too, can achieve it.”²⁰ Schenker disparages the music of blacks, such as “negro music” and jazz,²¹ and especially Negro spirituals, claiming that they were “completely falsified, dishonest expropriation of European music.”²² It seems Schenker liked these spirituals since he compared them with European music. But instead of according blacks a measure of artistic integrity, he reduces the genre to thievery, stripping it of its humanity, which, in turn, reflects his hatred of blackness. After World War I, Schenker laments that Germany must endure “the ignominy of [France’s Senegalese] black troops—the advance party of its genitals, of the flesh of its flesh, of the cannibal spirit of its spirit.”²³ Note here Schenker’s homoerotic

objectivization and fetishization of the black male body, a common dehumanizing tactic of the so-called biological race science of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

One point roundly disregarded in Schenker studies concerns his views against racial mixing, yet there can be no doubt that he disapproved of this mixing, which figured prominently in biological-race science. Schenker states, “‘Race’ is good, ‘inbreeding’ of race, however, is murky.”²⁴ Schenker expressed horror at the mixing of races in “Senegalese marriage relationships”²⁵ and “intermarrying black racial stock with. . . a French mother.”²⁶ This is paramount because white racial frame authors, on the rare occasion that they deal with the topic, have generally called Schenker’s racism cultural, and not biological, because linking Schenker to biological racism would ally him with eugenics, which would undoubtedly harm the promotion of his music theories. In other words, by calling Schenker’s racism cultural instead of what it was, biological, our white racial frame seeks to shield Schenker from unwanted criticism.

Schenker’s racism presented a problem for those who promoted his works. To solve this problem, his offensive writings were either removed or whitewashed for general consumption. Feagin states:

The dominant racial frame has sharply defined inferior and superior racial groups and authoritatively rationalized and structured the great and continuing racial inequalities of this [American] society. In a whitewashing process. . . this dominant framing has shoved aside, ignored, or treated as incidental numerous racial issues, including the realities of persisting racial discrimination and racial inequality.²⁷

¹⁵ Schenker (2015, online “Literature” supplement, 21).

¹⁶ Schenker ([1910 and 1922] 2001, vol. 1, 28).

¹⁷ Schenker diary entry, *Schenker Documents Online*, OJ 1/15, September 8, 1914, transcr. Marko Deisinger, trans. William Drabkin.

¹⁸ Schenker diary entry, *Schenker Documents Online*, OJ 1/15, August 20, 1914, transcr. Marko Deisinger, trans. William Drabkin.

¹⁹ Schenker diary entry, *Schenker Documents Online*, OJ 1/15, July 26, 1914, transcr. Marko Deisinger, trans. William Drabkin.

²⁰ Schenker, letter to Halm dated September 25, 1922, *Schenker Documents Online*, DLA 69.930/10, transcr. Ian Bent and Lee Rothfarb, trans. Lee Rothfarb.

²¹ Schenker ([1930] 2014, 77).

²² Schenker diary entry, *Schenker Documents Online*, OJ 4/4, January 16, 1931, transcr. Marko Deisinger, trans. William Drabkin.

²³ Schenker ([1921–1923] 2004, 15–16).

²⁴ Schenker, letter to Hoboken dated January 13, 1934, *Schenker Documents Online*, OJ 89/7, [2], transcr. and trans. John Rothgeb and Heribert Esser.

²⁵ Schenker ([1921–3] 2004, vol. 1, 5 and, specifically, 5n15).

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 18.

²⁷ Feagin ([2009] 2013, 22).

This is precisely what has happened with Schenker in our white racial frame.

Below I have listed six clear instances in which our white frame has “shoved aside, ignored, or treated as incidental” Schenker’s racism, stating that it has “no bearing” on his music theories, that it can be “disregarded,” that his “supposed indiscretions” were only “peripheral ramblings.” William Benjamin, citing Schenker’s “apparent racism,” even implies that not only was Schenker not racist, he was actually a closet egalitarian, while Nicolas Cook states that perhaps Schenker was only joking when he wrote the repugnant things he wrote. Indeed, the only thing that has been completely off the table in our white racial frame is simply calling Schenker the virulent racist he was.

1. Oswald Jonas omitted several passages of *Der freie Satz* “that have no bearing on the musical content of the work.”²⁸
2. Ernst Oster: “I felt it best to omit several additional passages of a very general, sometimes semiphilosophical nature here; these omissions are not expressly indicated.”²⁹
3. Allen Forte: “Almost none of the material bears substantive relation to the musical concepts that [Schenker] developed during his lifetime and, from that standpoint, can be disregarded.”³⁰
4. William Rothstein reduces Schenker’s offensive language to “supposed indiscretions” and “peripheral ramblings.”³¹
5. William Benjamin: “[Schenker’s] apparent racism was an emotional reflex which stood in contradiction to his personal belief system.”³²
6. Nicholas Cook offers “humor,” [i.e., Schenker was joking] as a possible reason for Schenker’s disgusting language.³³

In a seventh instance of sanitizing Schenker’s racism, in the Preface to Schenker’s *Counterpoint*, John Rothgeb states:

We urge the reader to recognize that however much Schenker may have regarded his musical precepts as an integral part of a unified world-view, they are, in fact, not at all logically dependent on any of his extramusical speculations. Indeed, no broader philosophical context is necessary—or even relevant—to their understanding.³⁴

Here Rothgeb is saying that not only was Schenker himself incorrect when he expressed that his racist “speculations” were key to his “musical precepts,” Rothgeb is actually implying that it would be inappropriate or unfair to examine race in Schenker’s theories. Finally, in an eighth example of whitewashing Schenker’s racism, among countless others, Cook says that it would be “not very helpful” to make the “obvious parallel” between Schenker’s theories on music and his theories on race when he speaks about Schenker’s “authoritarian impulse that is

expressed in the many hierarchies which make up Schenker’s worldview (it is tempting but I think not very helpful to draw the obvious parallel with his music theory).³⁵ What Cook means to say here is that it would be unhelpful to *music theory’s white racial frame* since it would call attention to race and whiteness.

I wish to recouple this severed link between Schenker’s beliefs about music and his beliefs about people. Ironically, the person who would most agree with this recoupling is Heinrich Schenker himself, who often spoke of how his unified worldview should be considered as a whole. Ultimately, our white racial frame’s removal and denial of race in the study of Schenker and his musical theories represents a textbook example of colorblind racism.

When reading Schenker’s music-theoretical works anew from a critical-race perspective, it is actually quite easy to see his racism in his music theories. As with the inequality of races, Schenker believed in the inequality of tones. For example, compare the following two passages, one concerning people, the other music:

But let the German mind also gather the courage to report: it is not true that all men are equal, since it is, rather, out of the question that the incapable ever become able; that which applies to individuals surely must apply to nations and peoples as well.³⁶

It is therefore a contradiction to maintain, for example, that all scale tones between “C” and “c” have real independence or, to use a current but certainly musically unsuitable expression, “equal rights.”³⁷

Here we begin to see how Schenker’s racism pervaded his music theories. In short, neither racial classes nor pitch classes were equal in Schenker’s theories, and he uses the same language to express these beliefs. As I said earlier, Schenker did not believe blacks were capable of self-governance. Since he wrote this in 1922, when virtually all of Africa was under white colonial rule, his sentiment is clear: blacks must be controlled by whites. Similarly, Schenker believes notes from the fundamental structure must control other notes. Compare his quote about how whites must control blacks with his quote about how the fundamental structure must control the middle and foreground:

Even negroes proclaim that they want to govern themselves because they, too, can achieve it.³⁸ [That is, whites must control blacks.]

The scale-degrees of the fundamental structure have decisive control over the middleground and foreground.³⁹

²⁸ Schenker ([1935] 1979, xiii).

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., xviii.

³¹ Rothstein (1986, 8).

³² Benjamin (1981, 157).

³³ Cook (2007, 148).

³⁴ Schenker ([1910 and 1922] 2001, xiv).

³⁵ Cook (2007, 153).

³⁶ Schenker (2015, online “Literature” supplement, 23n13).

³⁷ Schenker ([1935] 1979, 13n3).

³⁸ Schenker, letter to Halm dated September 25, 1922, *Schenker Documents Online*, DLA 69.930/10, transcr. Ian Bent and Lee Rothfarb, trans. Lee Rothfarb.

³⁹ Schenker ([1935] 1979, 111).

I have only scratched the surface in showing how Schenker's racism permeates his music theories, but this may actually be less important than how we present Schenker's work in the classroom. Philosopher Laurie Shrage makes an analogous point when speaking about her field's anti-Semitism:

When the anti-Semitic views of great thinkers such as Kant, Voltaire or Hume (or Hegel, Schopenhauer, Heidegger and Wittgenstein, for that matter) are exposed, one typical response is to question whether these prejudices are integral to their important works and ideas. But this may be the wrong question. A better question is: Should those who teach their works and ideas in the 21st century share them without mentioning the harmful stereotypes these thinkers helped to legitimize?⁴⁰

Hear! Hear! Clearly, philosophers have whitewashed the anti-Semitism of their important figures much the same way we have whitewashed Schenker's racism. At a minimum, we must present Schenker's work to our students in full view of his racist beliefs and let them decide what to do with that information. Like philosophy's antisemitism, the study of Schenker and his music theories has "helped to legitimize harmful stereotypes" about blacks and other POC—we music theorists can no longer ignore this simple fact.

Another danger to music theory is to be uncritical of the pervasive language of diversity, which Sara Ahmed describes as a managerial neoliberal term. In certain circumstances, she states that, "The term 'diversity' is a sign of the lack of commitment to change and might even allow organizations such as universities to conceal the operation of systematic inequalities."⁴¹ To a large extent, the language of diversity, which often actually reinforces our white racial frame, exists to avoid one simple concept: whiteness. Indeed, one of the main goals of our white racial frame is to take the focus off whiteness, yet only through directly confronting whiteness will we begin to see real change with respect to the racial makeup of music theory.

In a satirical piece, "How Can I Help to Promote Diversity without Relinquishing Any of My Power?" comedian Chandler Dean lays bare our dilemma:

Nice to see you. I'm an ally. As an upper-middle-class Northeastern American liberal college-educated cis straight white male, I'm aware of my privilege. And I'm willing to do anything to fight for progress—especially if it involves me telling you how aware of my privilege I am. So make no mistake: I will do anything to uplift the marginalized. As long as uplifting the marginalized doesn't involve diminishing my societal position in any fashion. That would, of course, be unfair.⁴²

Implicit in Dean's satire is our true challenge, that we must accept a measure of a "diminishing societal position," cede

some music-theoretical territory to nonwestern, nonwhite music theories in the academy, and make structural antiracist changes in our field. It is relatively easy to form a committee or task force to discuss diversity, but harder to reduce a four-semester undergraduate music-theory sequence that focuses solely on western theory to a two-semester sequence, clearing a path for two new semesters of nonwestern nonwhite music-theory core classes. Easy, relatively, to award grant monies to racial minorities to attend conferences, yet harder to scrap the German-language requirement, which is racist obviously, in music theory graduate programs. Easy, relatively, to institute a mentoring program for people of color in music theory, but harder to concede that Schenker's racism, which our white racial frame has whitewashed for nearly 100 years, deeply suffused his music theories and that we are obligated, as educators, to present Schenker's racism alongside his music theories—as Schenker himself would have wanted.

For my entire career, I have been firmly ensconced in our white racial frame, a figurative "white music theorist." But I am now conflicted. For to feed, sustain, and promote a system based on racialized structures and institutions is simply unacceptable in 2019. Is this our #MusicTheorySoWhite moment? I certainly hope so. Which is to say I hope that we can show the fortitude to face these inconvenient truths and change music theory for the better in the future.

WORKS CITED

- Ahmed, Sara. 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Aldwell, Edward, and Carl Schachter. 2011. *Harmony and Voice Leading*. 4th ed. Boston: Schirmer.
- Baldwin, James. 1962. "As Much Truth As One Can Bear." *The New York Times*, January 14. Accessed 1 July 2020. <https://nyti.ms/1Hf3cAu>
- Benjamin William E., Heinrich Schenker, Ernst Oster, 1981. "Schenker's Theory and the Future of Music." Review of Schenker's *Der Freie Satz*. *Journal of Music Theory* 25 (1): 155–173.
- Benward, Bruce, and Marilyn Saker. 2015. *Music in Theory and Practice*. 9th ed. 2 vols. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. [2003] 2018. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. 5th ed. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Burstein, L. Poundie, and Joseph N. Straus. 2016. *Concise Introduction to Tonal Harmony*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Brown, Jenine. 2018. "Annual Report on Membership Demographics." The Society for Music Theory, October. Accessed 1 July 2020. https://societymusictheory.org/files/SMT_Demographics_Report_2018.pdf.

⁴⁰ Shrage (2019).

⁴¹ Ahmed (2012, 53).

⁴² Dean (2019).

- Clendinning, Jane, and Elizabeth Marvin. 2016. *Musician's Guide to Theory and Analysis*. 3rd ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Cook, Nicholas. 2007. *The Schenker Project: Culture, Race, and Music Theory in Fin-de-siècle Vienna*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dean, Chandler. 2019. "How Can I Help to Promote Diversity without Relinquishing Any of My Power?" *McSweeney's*, January 9. Accessed 1 July 2020. <https://www.mcsweeney.net/articles/how-can-i-help-to-promote-diversity-without-relinquishing-any-of-my-power>
- Ewell, Philip. 2020. "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame." *Music Theory Online* 26 (2).
- Feagin, Joe. [2009] 2013. *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-framing*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Hall, Anne. 1996. "From the Committee on Diversity." *SMT Newsletter*, vol. 19/1, February.
- Kostka, Stefan, Dorothy Payne, and Byron Almén. 2018. *Tonal Harmony*. 8th ed. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Laitz, Steven G. 2014. *The Complete Musician: An Integrated Approach to Theory, Analysis, and Listening*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roig-Francoli, Miguel. 2010. *Harmony in Context*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Rothstein, William. 1986. "The Americanization of Heinrich Schenker." *In Theory Only* 9 (1): 5–17.
- Schenker Documents Online. Schenker Documents Online Project in collaboration with King's College London. Accessed August 7, 2020. <https://www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org/index.html>
- Schenker, Heinrich. [1910 and 1922] 2001. *Counterpoint: A Translation of Kontrapunkt by Heinrich Schenker*. Edited by John Rothgeb. New York: Schirmer Books.
- . [1921–1923] 2004. *Der Tonwille: Pamphelets in Witness of the Immutable Laws of Music, Offered to a New Generation of Youth*. Translated by Ian Bent, William Drabkin, Joseph Dubiel, Timothy Jackson, Joseph Lubben, and Robert Snarrenberg. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . [1930] 2014. *The Masterwork in Music*, vol. III. Edited by William Drabkin. Translated by Ian Bent, Alfred Clayton, and Derrick Puffett. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc.
- . [1935] 1979. *Der freie Satz*. Translated and edited by Ernst Oster. New York: Longman Publishers.
- . 1954. *Harmony*. Edited by Oswald Jonas. Translated by Elisabeth Mann Borgese. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2015. *Beethoven's Last Piano Sonatas: An Edition with Elucidation*. 4 vols. Translated, edited, and annotated by John Rothgeb. Oxford: Oxford University Press. See "Literature" on companion website at: www.oup.com/us/beethovenslastpianosonatas.
- Shrage, Laurie. 2019. "Confronting Philosophy's Anti-Semitism." *The New York Times*. March 18. Accessed 1 July 2020. <https://nyti.ms/2W5tn5x>.
- Straus, Joseph. 1996. "From the President." *SMT Newsletter*, vol. 19/1, February.

Not everyone was enthusiastic about Ewell's talk

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 15, 2019 at 11:31 AM EST (GMT-05:00)

To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Stephen Slottow <sslottow@gmail.com>; Justin <Justin.Lavacek@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <diego.cubero@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Gillian <Gillian.Robertson@unt.edu>

Dear Schenkerian colleagues,

Not everyone who attended the SMT was enthusiastic about Ewell's talk. I forward a comment I received today from a colleague with some Schenkerian chops:

"The talks at the plenary were demoralizing. I didn't really expect that much, but Philip Ewell's vitriolic attack on Schenkerism as the root of all white racism was disgusting.

He received a standing ovation. They need to read Richard Kramer's *Spectrum* review of the collection of Schenker's correspondence.

It's nice that Ewell cynically discussed intellectual anti-Semitism at the end of his talk, **without mentioning once that Schenker was a Jew**, that all of his Jewish disciples had to flee, that those who did not were murdered by the Nazis (including Schenker's wife and most talented students, i.e., Angelika Elias) and that they were hated here when they arrived. Instead, he accused them of institutionalizing racism in music theory, *precisely* because all of them abhor Schenker's political ideas."

I place in bold type some of the concerning comments.

When I was a student at CUNY, Saul Novack arranged for me to meet privately with Felix Salzer, who had recently retired from teaching because of the onset of dementia. Fortunately, when I visited him in his apartment, he was still almost completely lucid, and I spent the better part of a day just listening to him reminisce about his Vienna years, immigration to the US, studying with Schenker himself in the last year of his life. Later, after Salzer's death, I also met with his wife and had several long conversations with her about related topics. It is a pity that I did not record these discussions. During our conversation, Hans Weisse did not come up. However, I did discuss the topic of anti-Semitism with Weisse's daughter, who died some years ago, and that time I DID videotape the conversation. I need to dig out the tape and digitize it.

The fact of Schenker's Jewishness, and that of most of his students, came up repeatedly in all of these conversations in different contexts. It is of central importance to understanding the reception of Schenkerian Analysis first in Europe, in the period of the rise of Nazism, and then in early post-war America.

I need to listen to Ewell's talk before reacting. However, if it is indeed true that he does not mention Schenker's own Jewish identity, that raises questions.

With best wishes,

Tim



JACKS_086826

Material for the Committee

From: "Jackson, Timothy" <timothy.jackson@unt.edu>
To: "Ishiyama, John" <john.ishiyama@unt.edu>, "Wallach, Jennifer" <jennifer.wallach@unt.edu>, "Du, Jincheng" <jincheng.du@unt.edu>, "Guzman, Francisco" <francisco.guzman@unt.edu>, "Lemberger-Truelove, Matthew" <matthew.lemberger-truelove@unt.edu>
Cc: Michael Allen <m.allen@allen-lawfirm.com>, "Stowers, Renaldo" <renaldo.stowers@untsystem.edu>
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 2020 12:09:00 -0500
Attachments: Opinions-Chaouat.pdf (74.87 kB); Editorial Process of JSS vol 12 (condensed) Oct 13 2020.pdf (605.63 kB); Revised Levi Walls documentation Oct 4 2020 Oct. 13.pdf (929.16 kB); Letter to UNT Committee Oct 17 2020.pdf (872.53 kB)

Dear Colleagues,

Please see attached letter and documents:

1. My letter to UNT Committee Oct. 17, 2020
2. Editorial Process of JSS vol. 12
3. Revised Levi Walls documentation
4. Opinions-Chaouat

Sincerely,
Timothy Jackson



UNT_002645

Tone-Deaf and Colorblind

by Bruno Chaouat

In November 2019, a controversy broke out at the annual conference of the Society for Music Theory. The plenary lecture, delivered by Hunter College professor Philip Ewell, alleged the existence of elitism, color blindness, Eurocentrism, racism, and xenophobia in the field of music theory in North America. Ewell's main target was Heinrich Schenker, an Austrian Jewish music theorist of the early twentieth century who founded a school of classical music theory, and his disciples and heirs. Ewell objected to the "white racial frame" that dominates Schenkerian music theory. Classical music theory, and by extension classical music, are at best colorblind and at worst racist.

For Ewell, the problem is not primarily institutional but structural. Diversifying the demographics of classical music students and scholars will not do the trick. If "racism is a structure," then the "white racial frame"—classical music in its European incarnation—must be destroyed. The language of "white racial frame" is agonistic. A symbolic war must be waged for the defeat of a "white race." The reader will judge whether this anti-racist struggle can be compared to a racist one.

Ewell goes a step further: Dismantling the white racial frame will benefit not only people of color, but non-males and LGBTQ people as well. It is the solution to all forms of oppression. This conceit has a name: intersectionality. Proponents of intersectionality engage in secular eschatological and millenarian thinking—the end is close; justice is coming. We are

dealing here not with reason but with faith. There is neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for all are one in antiracism. Here is the new Epistle to the Galatians.

Heinrich Schenker has exerted considerable influence on the field of music analysis. Like so many German-speaking Jews of his generation, he celebrated German "genius" (a concept Ewell rejects as racist), outdid his gentile compatriots in patriotism, and resented the outcome of the First World War. In his literary and technical writings, one finds virulent anti-French, anti-American, and anti-British passages. Freud would have detected in this the "narcissism of small differences." We know that such narcissism bolstered European nationalisms and led to the suicide of Europe (arguably, twice in one century). Schenker held a Eurocentric worldview and was prone to the ethnic arrogance that accompanies it. The French version of such arrogance was called the "civilizing mission"—the idea that the French Second Empire and Third Republic were a light to the world and their mission was to colonize "primitive peoples" for their own good. Kipling notoriously coined this the "White Man's Burden."

But Schenker was also a music theory genius. He developed a complex method of analyzing tonal music, which he considered the model for universal music. For Schenker, tonal music has a metaphysical meaning. It represents the *harmonia mundi*, the great cosmic harmony, and composing tonal music is a way of paying

homage to the creation. When we listen to a sonata or a concerto composed in the heptatonic scale, we are carried through a sonorous narrative with an exposition, a development, and a resolution. Classical music is teleological—it has a beginning, a middle, and an end; it takes us through dissonances, conflicts of sounds; but it resolves the tensions and generally ends on a tonic chord. The result, for the classical music lover, is aesthetic pleasure. Classical music at once disorients and reassures. It invents within a familiar frame, within the strictures of a predictable code. We recognize the best composers by their ability to bend the code while conforming to it.

One may dislike classical music: Many do, and it is a vulnerable field—some say a dying field—today, but if one is touched by classical music, then understanding the rudiments of compositional writing is necessary. It helps the performer to discern the chromatic nuances of a piece, the amateur to hear better, and the music historian to trace influences. One aspect of Schenkerian analysis involves determining the hierarchy of sounds, discriminating the notes and chords that should be emphasized and the line that must be highlighted. Some notes and chords are more equal than others—even a mediocre performer knows that. When playing a sonata, one must heed the horizontal and the vertical lines, stressing this note rather than that. At the same time, there is room for creativity: Think of Glenn Gould's recreation of Bach. In the realm of literature and poetry, think of Charles Baudelaire's subversion of the lyric and his heralding of the breaking of the French alexandrine, the classical verse of twelve syllables.

Bruno Chaouat is professor of French and Jewish studies at the University of Minnesota.

Twelve-tone music would break the tonal scale in the early twentieth century, with Arnold Schoenberg. Dissonance triumphed, at least for a while. In poetry, broken and then free verses carried the day.

During his plenary lecture, Ewell took the hierarchical order of classical music literally and denounced it as a transposition of racial hierarchy. For Ewell, the culprit is less the domination of white composers in the history of music than something as abstract as “functional tonality.” He adds that if functional tonality has spread around the world, it is thanks to colonialism and European hegemony. Western music is a colonial endeavor. It has contaminated non-European cultures and harmonically oppressed nonwhite peoples. If the dominant chord is superior to the subdominant, it follows that white is superior to black. If Schenker wrote nationalistic and xenophobic pages, it follows that the core of his music theory is racist. Schenker, Ewell suggests, is the Comte de Gobineau of sounds.

Had he looked into the French musical lexicon, Ewell would have found grist for the mill. In French, a quarter note is called a *noire* (black), and a half note is a *blanche* (white). This cannot be a coincidence.

The most engaging passages of Ewell’s lecture allege a link between Schenker’s ideology and his music theory, and by extension classical music. Schenker’s language is naturalistic. Tones, like peoples and nations, grow organically. The opus is a corpus, the musical work behaves like a body, the genius is endowed with certain genes, and so on. Schenker was conscious of speaking metaphorically: “It is . . . a contradiction to maintain . . . that all scale tones between ‘C’ and ‘c’ have real independence or, to use a current *but certainly musically unsuitable* expression, ‘equal rights’” (emphasis mine). In his reading of that sentence, Ewell ignores Schenker’s recognition

that the phrase “equal rights” is relevant to music only as a metaphor. Ewell takes Schenker literally and imagines that classical music is rooted in racial hierarchy and contempt for equal rights. In another instance, Ewell claims that for Schenker, the white race should govern the people of Africa. From this claim (which I will not discuss, because it would demand a philological and contextual analysis of Schenker’s writings on the subject of Europe and race), Ewell infers that, *likewise*, “the scale degrees of the fundamental structure [read: the German people] . . . ‘have decisive control over the middleground and foreground [read: African peoples].’” This is an appalling hermeneutic.

Imagine a sports historian describing the rules of soccer and noticing that they include such words as “off-side,” “penalty kick,” “defending position” (in the back), and “attacking position” (in the front). A critical theorist, perhaps inspired by the thought of Michel Foucault, would deconstruct soccer based on a grammar of power, discipline, and hierarchy. Why should there be penalty kicks? Penalty belongs to the Western history of discipline and punishment. Soccer is a white elitist sport, invented in Cambridge, based on surveilling and disciplining bodies, and meant to bolster the British Empire. Soccer players of the world, unite to dismantle soccer’s white racial frame! The same logic would apply to chess—clearly a monarchic vestige. Beheading the king and queen is long overdue.

Ewell offers an alternative to the hegemony of the white racial frame. He suggests including the study of rap in music theory. Now deemed an art in its own right, with some of its artists receiving recognition in the world of letters and music, rap promotes “social justice” by fostering awareness of racism. With rap in the classroom, we kill two birds with one stone: We democratize music theory, and we instill a sense of morality in the youth. Rap, for Ewell and like-minded music

theorists, is the equivalent of socialist realism. It can be aesthetically complex and pleasing, but it also contributes to the revolution.

A number of scholars responded to Ewell’s attack in a special issue of the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies*. In his response, Timothy Jackson of the University of North Texas reminds us that Schenker was a Jew whose worldview changed upon the arrival of the Nazis. Schenker had a marginal position in Vienna compared to gentile music theorists. His disciples were Jews who emigrated to America and faced discrimination there. And as Jackson points out, Ewell sees the speck in the eye of classical music theory but not the plank in the eye of hip-hop, which is far from innocent of bigotry. In France and the U.S., rap lyrics are often violently anti-Semitic and sexist. In Russia, some hip-hop supports Putin’s autocracy. Rap also lends itself to conspiratorial thinking, including the anti-Semitic variety. Perhaps, by Ewell’s lights, rap’s anti-Semitism need not be taken seriously, since Jews are now construed as part of the power structure—as “white.” But isn’t seeing Jews as instrumental in the power structure an anti-Semitic trope?

The special issue of the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* elicited an open letter of condemnation from the Society for Music Theory. The editors of the journal were accused of, and subsequently investigated for, disrespecting academic standards of publication and promoting racism. For his part, Ewell is not content to call Jackson and other Schenkerian scholars racist. In a Facebook post, he calls Jackson an anti-Semite, though Jackson is Jewish.

What is of serious concern for the academy at large is the use of the power of the official organization of music theory scholars to censor a scholarly journal and its contributors. More than nine hundred signatories in the field endorsed an open letter in

which one can read, among other demands and recommendations: “We all need to ask ourselves: What have I done as an individual to perpetuate existing white supremacist systems of power and inequity in our field? Probing these questions in our work individually is essential to our collective reckoning.”

One mission of scholarship is to reveal structural relations between a thought and its thinker, a work and its author. I am thinking of Heidegger and the decades of violent debate regarding his Nazism. The core question is: Is Heidegger’s Nazism legible in his ontology? Is his ontology structurally Aryan? These are major questions, and indispensable for an understanding of the history of philosophy. I have read a great deal on the question, and I remain hesitant to condemn all of Heidegger’s philosophy as tainted with Nazism. Even if it were possible to decide that Heidegger’s thought is structurally

dependent on a Nazi philosophy, it would be immoral to threaten the careers of Heideggerian scholars. This is the first time since the Red Scare, to my knowledge, that a petition to investigate a journal and scholars for their defense of the object of their study has occurred.

Culture and education demand discrimination. Discrimination, from the Greek *krinein*, means judging, evaluating, and making distinctions. It is the basis of critical thinking. There can be no literature, no poetry, no painting, and no music (in fact, no sciences, no philosophy, and no sport, either) without a differentiation of forms and concepts and tones and colors. Hierarchy is part of any art form and any conceptual thought.

Robert Antelme, a communist Résistant, a friend of François Mitterrand, and the husband of modernist writer Marguerite Duras,

published his concentration camp testimony in 1947. *The Human Race* is a poignant call for human rights and a condemnation of totalitarianism and fascism. Antelme describes the language of the concentration camp: “Hell must be like that, a place where everything that is said is thrown up equally, as in a drunkard’s vomit.” Did Antelme mean that equality was a political feature of the camp? Quite the opposite. The barbarity of the SS system was characterized by the destruction of culture and by a language that had lost its syntax, a language of chaos and noise and bestial immediacy. Restoring civilization meant, among other things, retrieving language as a mediated form of communication.

Antelme’s vision of hell is uncannily relevant to us. What are the mobs on social media if not the equal, undifferentiated, and monotonous verbalization of unmediated affect? This is the opposite of what classical music stands for. ■

Editorial Process of JSS vol. 12

In my Webcast <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-BYEmzYAMok&t=4125s>, I mentioned being asked by Levi Walls and Ben Graf if we should publish anti-Schenkerian responses in the Symposium. The letter referenced is dated February 13, 2019, from Levi to me and copied to Ben asking me precisely that question. In his letter, Levi states that, although he and Ben disagreed with a lot of the arguments put forward by Ewell's supporters, he and Ben felt that we should publish their papers; of course, in the spirit of a dialectical scholarly discourse, I agreed, and therefore we published *all* of the pro-Ewell papers as well as the pro-Schenker responses.

[Members of the Editorial Board Correspondence re. Call for Papers, Nov. 25- Dec. 1, 2019]

Members of the editorial board correspondence re. the wording of the call for responses. Also, see Jackson message acknowledging the need for hiring more black/brown/Latino/Asian male and female music theorists.

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Nov 29, 2019 at 2:03 PM
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper
To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Cc: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>, Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>, Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>, Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>, Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>

Dear Colleagues,

I hate to be the fly in the ointment, but the call does not seem ready to me just yet. And here is why. Interestingly - and very significantly - in his abstract, Ewell says nothing at all about the talk's attack on 1) Schenker, 2) Schenkerians, and 3) Schenkerian methodology.

Indeed, given his abstract, most people would find nothing objectionable in it, and wonder why a call for responses would even be necessary. Most of us would agree that there are too few blacks and women in the field of music theory, and that it is desirable to try to recruit more.

But that is not the reason why the *JSS* is issuing this call for responses! The call still needs to make explicit *in some way* why *JSS*, which is focused on "Schenkerian Studies" as implied by its title, would need to "respond" to Ewell's remarks at the SMT at all, especially since the reason is not discernible in his abstract. We can include his

abstract if you want, but it is what he actually said about Schenker, Schenkerians, and Schenkerian methodology that matters and is the *raison d'être* for the call.

Therefore, we need to make the call draw attention to Ewell's conclusions in the paper he actually delivered, and not his abstract. Here is some language derived from Ewell's talk which might be used in the call: Schenker's concepts of scale degrees and dissonance resolution, and tonal hierarchy are inherently racist. (2:30) Study of Schenker's musical ideas has helped to legitimize harmful stereotypes about blacks and other people of color. (2:32) "Diversity" is a cynical strategy to reinforce inequality. (2:32) Reduce the study of Western music theory to two semesters (this would certainly solve a lot of problems, because then no one would even be able to attempt to study Schenker's ideas, which is apparently the point). (2:34) Schenker's followers (Forte, Oster, Rothgeb, Rothstein, and others) have suppressed the racist statements in translations of Schenker's publications in order to conceal his racist ideology.

THESE are the conclusions that Ewell explicitly draws about Schenker, Schenkerians, and Schenkerian methodology that are at the core of his argument, and the reason why the *Journal* is eliciting responses. If we do not make this point explicit, then we run the risk of appearing reactionary and racist ourselves!

This issue needs to be addressed BEFORE we are ready to go forward.
Best, Tim

From: Walls, Levi
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 1:00 PM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Dear Drs. Bakulina, Chung, and Cubero,
The *JSS* is preparing to send out a call for responses to the Ewell paper at SMT. We all thought it would be prudent to get input from other faculty members regarding the specific framing of the call. Please let us know if you have any thoughts on improving the language of the call, especially in regards to inclusiveness and impartiality:

The SMT paper given by Philip Ewell, "Music Theory's White Racial Frame," has inspired a good deal of debate within the Schenkerian community. As a journal dedicated to Schenkerian studies, we find it important to foster these discussions. As part of volume 12, we invite interested parties to submit essay responses to Ewell's paper. The *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* takes no official stance on the issues addressed by Ewell, and we hope to publish a variety of thoughts and

perspectives. Submissions must adhere to the following guidelines:
Essays should be 1,000 to 3,000 words in length.
In order to leave sufficient time for editorial work, submissions must observe a strict deadline of January 13, 2019.
Any questions or concerns regarding submissions may be directed at the editors (Schenker@unt.edu).
Regards,
Levi Walls (with Drs. Jackson, Slottow, and Graf in copy)

From: "Chung, Andrew" <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>
Date: Monday, November 25, 2019 at 1:07 PM
To: "Walls, Levi" <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>, "Bakulina, Ellen" <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>, "Cubero, Diego" <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>, "Slottow, Stephen" <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>, "Graf, Benjamin" <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: RE: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Dear Levi + others,

I think it's great that JSS is looking to engage Ewell's SMT talk. What do you think about mentioning very briefly some of the content and context of Ewell's remarks vis-à-vis Schenker? As the CFP stands, it seems to presume that everyone knows what Ewell said, and what tendencies of Schenker's Ewell chose to talk about (most readers probably do understand both of these things). The thing to be careful about, of course, is not to implicitly encourage responses of one kind and discourage responses of another kind.

Cheers,
Dr. Chung

From: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 1:15 PM
To: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper
Good idea. One way this could be done is to reproduce Ewell's SMT abstract and link to the SMT reproduction of his slides and video of his talk, which is on both the SMT and his Hunter website. I'm not sure how long it'll stay on the SMT website.
-sps
Stephen Slottow

Associate Professor of Music Theory
University of North Texas

From: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 11:32:30 AM
To: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Oh, and change January 13, 2019 to 2020.
-EB

From: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 1:22 PM
To: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Yes, good idea to provide link to the recording of Ewell's talk. As far as I know, it will be available on the SMT website until January 15, which is after your January 13 deadline, so there is no problem here.

Could you specify that the paper was part of the plenary session? Right now, it looks like it was a regular SMT paper (which would probably produce less reverberation than a plenary one).

As for encouraging different kinds of responses, the CFP already says "variety of thoughts and perspectives." I think this is quite clear.
All best,
-EB

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2019 6:21 AM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Hi all,

Thank you all very much for the input. Drs. Jackson, Slottow, and Graf, I'll draft a final version of the call and get it back to you around midday, then we can discuss how to proceed. We should be able to send it out today.

Regards,
Levi Walls

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2019 12:24 PM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>

Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Dear Drs. Jackson, Slottow, Graf, et al.,

I've attached a new version of the call. Let me know if it looks okay, or if there are any other issues that come to mind.

Dr. Bakulina, I believe that was the plan. Dr. Jackson also mentioned sending it to the Sibelius and Estonian academies. We'll have to confirm exactly how/where to send it out.

Regards,
Levi Walls

On Fri, Nov 29, 2019 at 12:55 PM Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu> wrote:

Hi all,

Here is a new copy of the call with "Schenkerian community" changed to "theory community" and the January 13 deadline. How/where should we send it out? We previously discussed using the SMT list and possible other places (Estonian and Sibelius academies).

Regards,
Levi Walls

Journal of Schenkerian Studies vol. 12 (2019) Call for Papers

The SMT plenary presentation given by Philip Ewell, "Music Theory's White Racial Frame," has inspired a good deal of debate within the Schenkerian community. As a journal dedicated to Schenkerian studies, we find it important to foster these discussions. As part of volume 12, we invite interested parties to submit essay responses to Ewell's paper. The *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* takes no official stance on the issues addressed by Ewell, and we hope to publish a variety of thoughts and perspectives. Submissions must adhere to the following guidelines: Essays should be 1,000 to 3,000 words in length.

In order to leave sufficient time for editorial work, submissions must observe a strict deadline of January 13, 2020.

Any questions or concerns regarding submissions may be directed at the editors (Schenker@unt.edu).

Please refer to Ewell's abstract, as well as links to the presentation slides and video recording (listed below):

On Nov 26, 2019, at 12:39 PM, Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu> wrote:
Looks good to me. Thanks for asking for our opinions!
-EB

From: Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2019 2:00 PM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Cc: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper
Dear Levi and all,
The call looks good. I would make the two following suggestions:
1. There is a passage that reads: "We invite interested parties to submit essay responses to Ewell's paper." I would change it to: "We invite responses to Ewell's paper."
2. I do not like the phrase "Schenkerian community." It is quite exclusive. Think of a way to reword this sentence. I will, too.
2. Extend the deadline at least to February 1st. A month and a half is a pretty short turn around, especially considering that it is the holidays.
Best,
Diego

From: "Graf, Benjamin" <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Date: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 at 9:44 AM
To: "Cubero, Diego" <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>, "Bakulina, Ellen" <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Cc: "Walls, Levi" <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>, "Slottow, Stephen" <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>, "Chung, Andrew" <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Dear Diego and all,
I completely agree with point #2, which is now changed to "theory community" (thank you Levi).

As to the deadline-- from an editor's perspective, we really cannot delay the submissions further. There is quite a bit of work that must be done after the submissions come in. For example, the following timeline would be a fair estimate:

Feb 1: collect submissions
Feb 15: editing submissions
Feb 27: revisions complete
March 8: add front/back matter, ads, sign and collect contributor agreement forms
March 15: Karen at UNT Press reads final PDF
March 25: document sent to printers
April/May: we get print copies

Again, from an editor's perspective, it would be best to not delay further. The responses should not be very long, so I hope that we can stick to January 13th.

Best,

Ben

Benjamin Graf, Ph.D.

University of North Texas

Music History, Theory and Ethnomusicology

Office: MU215

From: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 10:56 AM

To: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego

<Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>

Cc: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew

<Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

In that case, it may be well to backdate submissions to—say, November 1st, 2019.

That way we'll have them before the call is sent out, which would be convenient for all concerned, I should think. This would create an alternative time line, which we could utilize as needed.

-sps

Stephen Slottow

Associate Professor of Music Theory

University of North Texas

[Final draft of Ewell CFP, Nov. 26-30, 2020]

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Tue, Nov 26, 2019,

3:52 PM

to Benjamin, me, Stephen

Dear all,

Here is a final draft of the CFP. Taking Dr. Cubero's advice, I changed "Schenkerian community" to "theory community" and I also moved the deadline to February 1st. When I spoke to Ron, he actually said that it would be okay to extend it further than January; the timeline is rather flexible for the journals, he said. Let

me know if we should change anything else. Otherwise, we can decide how to send it out.

Regards,
Levi Walls
Attachments area

Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Nov 26, 2019,9:59 PM to Levi, Benjamin, me

Dear Levi,
Those two changes aren't on the "final" draft. When they are, the CFP seems fine.
-sps
Hold off sending out the Call until....

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sat, Nov 30, 2019,
3:17 PM

to Levi, Ellen, Stephen, Benjamin

Dear Levi,

Let's hold off sending out the call with Ewell's remarks until:

1. Everyone has had a chance to read my transcript of Ewell's remarks on Schenker, which still need some editing.
2. It would be correct to hold off sending out the call until we have had the opportunity to send it to Rothstein, Rothgeb, and Benjamin and ask them if they wish to reply.

Ellen can ask Rothstein. I can ask Bill Benjamin, with whom I have a friendly connection, and Rothgeb, who I do not know personally; however, I believe that he knows me by reputation.

Best wishes, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sat, Nov 30, 2019, 10:14 PM
to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Sorry for the delay. I've been deeply preoccupied in writing. Alright, we'll wait to hear from the others and proceed from there! I will respond to all the details you've kindly shared with me about Bach. I'm just a bit behind in research for papers and going through that final push.

Regards,
Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 30, 2019 1:17:15 PM

To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Cc: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Stephen Slottow <sslottow@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: [EXT] Hold off sending out the Call until....

[Discussions about the appropriate time for CFP by JSS, Dec. 1-4, 2019]

Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>

Sun, Dec 1, 2019,

6:53 PM

to Diego, Levi, me,

Benjamin, Stephen

Dear All,

I just had a conversation with a colleague about the SMT plenary session (of which Ewell's talk was part), and he told me what I should have known all along, because this was announced right before the presentations: that the plenary talks will be published in Music Theory Spectrum. You all probably knew about this too. I was just extremely tired on the day of the plenary session (I presented a paper myself on the same day, earlier, had a 7 a.m. committee meeting, and had to present another paper the following day) and, I guess, that's why I missed some of the information.

Does the prospective Spectrum publication means that, perhaps we should wait with our call for responses until after that publication appears?

All best,

-Ellen

Sun, Dec 1, 2019, 7:51 PM

to Ellen, me, Benjamin, Stephen, Diego

Dr. Bakulina, and all,

That does seem to complicate matters a bit. I had briefly heard something to that effect shortly after SMT, then promptly forgot all about it.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2019 4:53:37 PM

To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson

<shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>;

Stephen Slottow <sslottow@gmail.com>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sun, Dec 1, 2019,

10:06 PM

to Ellen, Levi, Benjamin, Stephen

Dear Ellen, Colleagues,

All things considered, JSS should go forward with the call as planned. What we are asking for from scholars are considered responses to the Plenary Session talk by Ewell as it was delivered and has been posted on line. We have already received one succinct, but nonetheless important comment from a very prominent scholar who has watched the video, read the transcript, and would like us to publish his reply, - and we definitely *should* publish it. More responses have promised - and have even been requested. Therefore, if others are interested in responding but wish to wait for the published version of Ewell's talk, then they are welcome to do so, and we should be open to publishing additional responses to that version in a subsequent issue (after the upcoming one) of the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies*.
Best, Tim

Graf, Benjamin Dec 2, 2019, 9:14 AM

I agree with Tim. We should go forward with the call and be open to publishing more on this matter in future publications. Ben

Benjamin Graf, Ph.D.

University of North Texas

Graf,

Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>

Dec 2, 2019, 6:40

PM

to me, Ellen, Levi, Stephen

Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>

Dec 2, 2019, 6:40 PM

to me, Ellen, Levi, Stephen

Tim (CC: Stephen, Ellen, and Levi),

Levi and I spoke briefly today about the call, and we both agreed that we don't want the call to 1) be too lengthy or 2) "lead" contributors to comment on only excerpted quotations instead of encouraging them to digest the entire paper (then draft responses as they feel appropriate).

Perhaps the official call can be shorter, but you could send some excerpts and lengthier thoughts to your close colleagues in addition to the formal CFP.

Let me know your thoughts if you have a chance. We are, of course, flexible!

Best,

Ben

Benjamin Graf, Ph.D.

University of North Texas

Music History, Theory and Ethnomusicology

Office: MU215

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2019 10:06 PM

To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>

Cc: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin
<Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Stephen Slottow <sslottow@gmail.com>
Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Dec 3, 2019, 9:22 AM

to Diego, Andrew, Benjamin, Ellen, Levi, Stephen

Dear Ben, Colleagues,

We still have to address the issue of *why* the *JSS* in particular is asking for responses. I thought that Andrew's point was very well taken, namely that we don't want to be seen to be disagreeing with Ewell's broader point of advocating inclusion of different ethnicities in the discipline of music theory, which I assume that we all support and is not contentious, at least here, but rather focus on his central example of racism in music theory, namely on Schenker, Schenkerian scholars, and Schenkerian analysis. As you know, independently I came to exactly the same conclusion as Andrew. We need to judge the call carefully, and make it clear that Ewell's hypothesis of Schenkerian racism is the primary focus.

To address both issues of reducing the length of the general call, and placing the focus squarely on Ewell's attack on Schenker, Schenkerian scholars, and the Schenkerian approach as racist, rather than including ALL of Ewell's comments, I think that we ought to focus on quoting just a few of his representative statements. Therefore I would propose citing the following short quote in the call: "The best example through which to examine our white frame is through Heinrich Schenker, a fervent racist, whose racism undoubtedly influenced his music theory, yet it gets whitewashed for general consumption.....In his voluminous writings, Schenker often mentions white and black as modifiers for human races.....As with the inequality of races, Schenker believed in the inequality of tones. Here we begin to see how Schenker's racism pervaded his music theories. In short, neither racial classes, nor pitch classes, were equal in Schenker's theories. He uses the same language to express these beliefs.....his sentiment is clear: blacks must be controlled by whites. Similarly, Schenker believed notes from the fundamental structure must control other notes."

We can then solicit responses.

I think that we can omit Ewell's "conspiracy theory" that a group of Schenkerian scholars whitewashed Schenker's racism from the call, since this issue will be dealt with directly by scholars Ewell accuses. For example, Nicholas Cook from Cambridge has agreed to send us a response.

I would, however, send the complete transcript of Ewell's remarks on Schenker to both Drabkin and Bent since Ewell's case is largely built on comments in the letters and diary quoted from their SDO. The same for Rothstein, since he is also included in the group of Schenkerian scholars critiqued. Ben and Levi: please cc. me and Stephen on your letters to Drabkin and Bent. You should send them now, if you have not already done so.

I have already written to John Rothgeb. My understanding is that he is pretty reclusive, so I am unsure whether he will respond. I do have his cell phone number,

so that if I don't hear from him in a few days or so, I will also try calling him.
Ellen will let us know when Rothstein replies.
It is a shame that Allen and Oster cannot respond. I know that Allen would.
However, Allen did give me a copy of his correspondence with Oster, and I will
check it to see if the issue of moving certain paragraphs into the appendices came
up. I recall that it did. If so, I see no reason why we should not publish this part of
the correspondence, since it will document the reasons for the decision.
With best wishes,
Tim

Stephen Slottow <sslottow@gmail.com>

Dec 3, 2019,

10:06 AM

to me

Dear Tim,

Who holds the rights for the Forte's correspondence with Oster? We may want to
find out before publishing letters verbatim. I think that we may be allowed to
publish small excerpts without permission, but I don't really know. Perhaps it would
be best to check with Wayne Alpern or someone else who knows copyright law?
Also, I tried to reach Rothgeb re my sequence article but was unsuccessful.
Evidently the email addresses I got from Carl and Charles aren't good any longer,
or he just didn't respond. Since you have his phone number, I'd try that first.
-sps

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Dec 3, 2019, 11:34 AM

to Stephen

Dear Stephen,

I have a letter from Allen to the effect that I have the right to publish anything that
I want to from his Nachlass. He gave this letter to me long before he got really
sick. He was concerned about being misrepresented.

Please keep this next item private. I have been in touch with Madeleine, pointing
out my disgust that Ewell, a former student, accused Allen of "whitewashing"
Schenker's racism. She confronted a number of other former students about it,
who reassured her, "don't worry, everything is just fine." Madeleine, who is very
sharp, sees through it, and does not concur. She agrees with me and she wishes
me to respond - properly - and in due course. She will not raise any objections to
us publishing anything that Allen gave me. I do need to dig out the
correspondence and go through it. I think that I also made a copy for you. You
might look through it as well.

Best, Tim

Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>

Dec 4, 2019, 9:26 AM

to Diego, Andrew,

Ellen, Levi, me, Stephen

Tim and colleagues,
That sounds good to me! I am on board.
Ben
Benjamin Graf, Ph.D.
University of North Texas
Music History, Theory and Ethnomusicology
Office: MU215

[Jackson corresponded with Nicolas Cooke, David Beach, Allen Cadwallader, Boyd Pomeroy, and Jack Boss.]

Jackson sounded out authorities on Schenkerian analysis to see what they thought about Ewell's presentation, and whether they wanted to respond. But then, since the negative replies received seemed too one-sided, Jackson decided to ask UNT colleagues if they would consider a Symposium with both pros. and cons. We worked on the "Call for Papers" in the theory area, came up with a call, and sent it out. Due to delays in getting the CFP posted the time period was short, just two weeks, but we gave extensions until the beginning of March to all who indicated that they wanted to contribute.

[Initial Efforts to send CFP through to the SMT list on Dec. 19, 2020]

schenker
Thu 12/19/2019 4:42 PM
To: Jackson, Timothy; Slottow, Stephen
Cc: Graf, Benjamin
JSS CFP_ Philip Ewell responses (1) (2).docx
17 KB
Hi all,
Dr. Graf and I are both having trouble getting this call through to the SMT list. Neither of our emails seem to be accepted. Could one of you please try with your email? Thanks!
Regards,
Levi Walls

[Journal of Schenkerian Studies vol. 12 (2019) Call for Papers]

The SMT plenary presentation given by Philip Ewell, "Music Theory's White Racial Frame," has inspired a good deal of debate within the theory community, especially regarding the possible relationship between Schenkerian methodology and the white racial frame (as suggested in the following quote from Ewell):
"The best example through which to examine our white frame is through Heinrich

Schenker, a fervent racist, whose racism undoubtedly influenced his music theory, yet it gets whitewashed for general consumption.....In his voluminous writings, Schenker often mentions white and black as modifiers for human races.....As with the inequality of races, Schenker believed in the inequality of tones. Here we begin to see how Schenker's racism pervaded his music theories. In short, neither racial classes, nor pitch classes, were equal in Schenker's theories. He uses the same language to express these beliefs.....his sentiment is clear: blacks must be controlled by whites. Similarly, Schenker believed notes from the fundamental structure must control other notes."

As a journal dedicated to Schenkerian studies, we find it important to foster discussion on these issues. As part of volume 12, we invite interested parties to submit essay responses to Ewell's paper. The Journal of Schenkerian Studies takes no official stance on the issues addressed by Ewell, and we hope to publish a variety of thoughts and perspectives. Submissions must adhere to the following guidelines:

1. Essays should be 1,000 to 3,000 words in length.
2. In order to leave sufficient time for editorial work, submissions must observe a strict deadline of January 13, 2020.

Any questions or concerns regarding submissions may be directed at the editors (Schenker@unt.edu).

Please refer to Ewell's abstract, as well as links to the presentation slides and video recording (listed below):

Music Theory's White Racial Frame

Philip Ewell (Hunter College and The Graduate Center, CUNY)

For over twenty years music theory has tried to diversify with respect to race, yet the field today remains remarkably white. SMT's most recent report on demographics shows that 90.4 percent of full-time employees in music theory are white, while 93.9 percent of associate/full professors are. Aside from this literal whiteness, there exists a figurative and even more deep-seated whiteness in music theory. This is the whiteness—which manifests itself in the composers we choose to represent our field inside and outside of the classroom, and in the theorists that we elevate to the top of our discipline—that one must practice, regardless of one's own personal racial identity, in order to call oneself a music theorist. Thus, for example, I am a black person, but I am also a practitioner of "white music theory." In this presentation, a critical-race examination of the field of music theory, I try to come to terms with music theory's whiteness, both literal and figurative. By drawing on the writings of sociologists Joe Feagin and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, among others, I posit that there exists a "white racial frame" (Feagin) in music theory that is structural and institutionalized. Further, I highlight certain racialized structures which "exist because they benefit members of the dominant white race" (Bonilla-Silva). Ultimately, I argue that only through a deframing and reframing of this white racial frame will we begin to see positive racial changes in music theory.

PowerPoint slides: <http://philipewell.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/SMTPlenary-Slides.pdf>

Video recording: <https://vimeo.com/372726003>

[CALL FOR PAPERS originally sent to the whole SMT list network on Dec. 17, 2019]

From: schenker

Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2019 11:03:17 PM

To: smt-announce@lists.societymusictheory.org <smtannounce@lists.societymusictheory.org>

Subject: Journal of Schenkerian Studies CFP

Greetings,

Please find attached a CFP from the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies*, to be distributed as soon as possible. Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns. Thanks so much!

Regards,

Levi Walls

Assistant Editor, JSS

[CALL FOR PAPERS sent to all the members of SMT via SMT mailing list on Dec. 31, 2019]

From: Bob Kosovsky kos@panix.com

Subject: Fwd: [Smt-Announce] CFP: Journal of Schenkerian Studies

Date: December 31, 2019 at 8:06 PM

To: smt-announce@societymusictheory.org

Cc: Levi Walls LeviWalls@my.unt.edu

Forwarded message from: Levi Walls <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Journal of Schenkerian Studies vol. 12 (2019) Call for Papers

The SMT plenary presentation given by Philip Ewell, "Music Theory's White Racial Frame," has inspired a good deal of debate within the theory community, especially regarding the possible relationship between Schenkerian methodology and the white racial frame (as suggested in the following quote from Ewell):

"The best example through which to examine our white frame is through Heinrich Schenker, a fervent racist, whose racism undoubtedly influenced his music theory, yet it gets whitewashed for general consumption.....In his voluminous writings, Schenker often mentions white and black as modifiers for human races.....As with the inequality of races, Schenker believed in the inequality of tones. Here we begin to see how Schenker's racism pervaded his music theories. In short, neither racial classes, nor pitch classes, were equal in Schenker's theories. He uses the same language to express these beliefs.....his sentiment is clear: blacks must be controlled by whites. Similarly, Schenker believed notes from the fundamental structure must control other notes."

As a journal dedicated to Schenkerian studies, we find it important to foster discussion on these issues. As part of volume 12, we invite interested parties to submit essay responses to Ewell's paper. The Journal of Schenkerian Studies takes no official stance on the issues addressed by Ewell, and we hope to publish a variety of thoughts and perspectives. Submissions must adhere to the

following guidelines:

Essays should be 1,000 to 3,000 words in length.

In order to leave sufficient time for editorial work, submissions must observe a strict deadline of January 20, 2020.

Any questions or concerns regarding submissions may be directed at the editors (Schenker@unt.edu).

Please refer to Ewell's abstract, as well as links to the presentation slides and video recording (listed below):

Music Theory's White Racial Frame

Philip Ewell (Hunter College and The Graduate Center, CUNY)

For over twenty years music theory has tried to diversify with respect to race, yet the field today remains remarkably white. SMT's most recent report on demographics shows that 90.4 percent of full-time employees in music theory are white, while 93.9 percent of associate/full professors are. Aside from this literal whiteness, there exists a figurative and even more deep-seated whiteness in music theory. This is the whiteness—which manifests itself in the composers we choose to represent our field inside and outside of the classroom, and in the theorists that we elevate to the top of our discipline—that one must practice, regardless of one's own personal racial identity, in order to call oneself a music theorist. Thus, for example, I am a black person, but I am also a practitioner of "white music theory." In this presentation, a critical-race examination of the field of music theory, I try to come to terms with music theory's whiteness, both literal and figurative. By drawing on the writings of sociologists Joe Feagin and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, among others, I posit that there exists a "white racial frame" (Feagin) in music theory that is structural and institutionalized. Further, I highlight certain racialized structures which "exist because they benefit members of the dominant white race" (Bonilla-Silva). Ultimately, I argue that only through a deframing and reframing of this white racial frame will we begin to see positive racial changes in music theory.

[Footnote: Coined by sociologist Joe Feagin in 2006, the term "white racial frame" refers to the "broad worldview [that is] essential to the routine legitimation, scripting, and maintenance of systemic racism in the United States."]

PowerPoint slides: <http://philipewell.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/SMTPlenary-Slides.pdf>

Video recording: <https://vimeo.com/372726003>

Smt-announce mailing list

Smt-announce@lists.societymusictheory.org <http://lists.societymusictheory.org/listinfo.cgi/smt-announce-societymusictheory.org>

[Should anti-Schenker pro-Ewell responses be published?]

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Thu, Feb 13,
10:54 AM

to me, benjamingraf@unt.edu

Dear Dr. Jackson (with Dr. Graf in copy; Dr. Slottow not copied because he asked to be recused),

Dr. Graf and I were wondering what your thoughts were concerning the submissions from Clark, Beaudoin, and Lett. As you may have seen, these responses are (at least) implicitly anti-Schenkerian. Despite disagreeing with much of what they have to say, Dr. Graf and I think it is important to publish these responses along with the others that we have received (Wiener, Pomeroy, Wen, Cadwallader, etc.). We wouldn't want the JSS's account of the debate to appear one-sided, and having a mixture of opinions will lend more credibility to those responses that we do agree with. Just want to check in with you before we proceed!

And thank you for all your time and effort in getting responses from prominent names in the field!

Regards,

Levi Walls

I agreed and they were published.

[Correspondence with Jack Boss, Levi, Jackson, with Slottow, and Graf on copy, March 9-10, 2020]

From: schenker <schenker@unt.edu>

Date: Monday, March 9, 2020 at 11:49 PM

To: Jack Boss <jfboss@uoregon.edu>

Subject: Ewell Response Final Proof

Hi Jack,

I have the final proof of your response for you. Please let me know if anything needs to change. I assumed you wanted both images to be placed together for ease of comparison. I'll be sending final proofs to UNT press by the end of the day on Tuesday (3/10), but there will be a window of a few days to make changes if necessary. Thanks!

Regards,

Levi Walls
Assistant Editor, *JSS*

Mar 10, 2020, 2:07 AM

Jack Boss <jfboss@uoregon.edu>
to schenker, me

Hi Levi (and Tim). The response looks good. The only issue I have is that Songwriters Guild of America (the copyright administrator for the Ann Ronell song) has not yet responded to me with permission to reproduce the Tatum score excerpt (it's been about a week). So we could get into trouble for reprinting 11 measures without getting permission. Do we want to risk that? I suppose it might be possible to get around it by resetting the score (redoing it in Finale or Sibelius), since there are a couple of transcriptions out there. Or we could leave out the score and just print my graph.

Jack Boss

Professor of Music Theory and Composition
Chair, SMT Publications Committee
School of Music and Dance
1225 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1225
email: jfboss@uoregon.edu

phone: 541-556-6139

fax: 541-346-0723

Tue, Mar 10, 2:19 AM

schenker <schenker@unt.edu>
to Jack, me

Hi again,

Sure. If you think resetting the score would be acceptable (I imagine it will), I could do that and replace the image with our own. I'll send a new version in a bit.

Regards,
Levi Walls

Tue, Mar 10, 4:12 AM

schenker <schenker@unt.edu>
to Jack, me

Dear Jack,

Here is the updated version, with a custom transcription of the Tatum score.

Let me know if this looks alright. Thanks!

Regards,
Levi Walls

Mar 10, 2020, 9:20 AM

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
to Levi, Benjamin, Stephen, Jack

Dear Jack, with Colleagues on copy,

I think that it looks really good the way it is, and now it is possible to follow your analysis with the music. Would it be possible for you to phone the Songwriters Guild of America and check with them to see if it is OK? I have found that sometimes this is the best way to deal with issues like this, especially given time constraints.

Otherwise, I am unsure of the current rules of "fair use," but there is a certain amount of quotation allowed. Then the question would be exactly how much can we reprint? My guess - but it is only a guess - is that this short quotation would be OK. But perhaps this can be checked.

Tim

[Final Addition - correspondence between Jackson and Levi Walls, March 12, 2020]

Final addition

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 12, 9:19 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I am sorry to burden you with this, but will do so anyway! I hope that it might still be possible to make one last addition to my conclusion without throwing the train off the track. Could you please insert the few sentences indicated in red in the final paragraph, and one last footnote. I think that the point is significantly important to try to make it, albeit just before the train leaves the station!

Although we now live in an era of "alternative facts," I believe that demagoguery and intellectual dishonesty must not go unanswered. We have seen what occurs when this happens on a massive scale, with catastrophic results in the 20th century, and now again in our own time. I was not present when Ewell spoke at the SMT plenary session, but I heard about the standing ovation he received, which, to my mind, is just as worrying as his talk itself. The warm reception, the applause that Ewell earned there, is as outrageous and dangerous as the contents of his speech, and bespeaks the sorry state of the field of music theory generally these days. Schenkerians of the different pedagogical schools have always "decoupled" ideological claims from music theoretical approaches. Furthermore, not only did Schenker's own ideas about politics and race evolve considerably (as I have shown), so did his analytical methodology (as Pastille, Bent, and others have amply documented). Looking back, at least two generations of Schenkerians have explored and critiqued the evolutions of both aspects. For example, what a tremendous transformation there is between Schenker's early and later ideas about just the particular issue of organicism; the same holds true for his views of race, which also changed dramatically![] Ewell assures us that Schenker would have objected to "decoupling" his philosophical, historical, political, racial, and other ideas from his

music theory. But is this claim really as self-evident as it might initially seem, since the question then becomes: which philosophical-historical-political ideas cannot be disassociated from which stages of music-theoretical development, given the very significant advances in both dimensions? Therefore, even Schenker himself must have recognized, especially late in his career, not only the possibility, but the absolute necessity of such decoupling. Some would like to demolish the classical canon of "Bach-to-Brahms," falsely claiming it to be exclusively a "white male" elitist meritocracy, and arguing that we should replace it with putatively egalitarian pop, hip-hop, punk, and world musics. This is a mischaracterization because the great tradition of classical music includes Black, Jewish, and female composers, and remains, as Schenker ultimately recognized, an "elitism of the hearing of the spirit, not of race." A colleague recently wondered - given the apparent current lack of focus on "the notes" of complete pieces within the Bach-to-Brahms canon (unfortunately, also a concept associated with Schenkerian analysis) - if we music theorists were not now metamorphosing into non-theorists. In other words, by divorcing ourselves from the detailed investigation of the structure of pieces within the canon - which now, because deemed elitist, becomes obsolete - we will all wake up one morning soon, just like the protagonist of Kafka's *Metamorphosis*, who found himself a giant beetle. But, perhaps, just as Schenker finally saw the light, albeit late in life, we music theorists will eventually also come to our senses. In all cases, better late than never.

[i] William Pastille, "Heinrich Schenker, Anti-Organicist," *19th-Century Music*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Summer, 1984), pp. 29-36.

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Thu, Mar 12, 9:39 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

No worries, I still have to put the page numbers for Slottow and Wiener into your response, anyway. As soon as I have Dr. Slottow's response, I will know the page numbers for sure, and will be able to cite them in yours. So I will add these sentences while I am at it.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2020 7:19 PM

To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Subject: [EXT] Final addition

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Thu, Mar 12, 10:03 PM to me

I've added the new sentences. I'm just waiting for those page numbers now. As soon as I get Dr. Slottow's response, I'll add the page numbers for Slottow and Wiener. As you previously specified I'll format it like so: "Since Stephen Slottow

addresses that issue (pp. x-x)..." "Furthermore, as Barry Wiener shows (pp. xx)..."
- Levi Walls

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 12, 10:15PM

to Levi

Great!

By the way, I added you to my Skype contacts! So that way, we can talk if needed.

Best, Tim

[Levi's Introduction - Revising Process, March 9-10, 2020]

Symposium intro

Inbox x

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mon, Mar 9, 10:54 PM

to me, Stephen, Benjamin

Dear Drs. Jackson and Slottow,

Here is the intro that Dr. Graf and I put together. Let us know what you think!

Short and sweet, as I said. Did Wen ever send a response? I think that is the only one we are missing.

Regards,

Levi Walls

Attachments area

[Preview attachment Ewell intro.pdf](#)

[Ewell intro.pdf](#)

Timothy Jackson Tue, Mar 10, 9:07 AM

Dear Levi and Ben,

It looks very good to me. Eric Wen wrote to me that he just could not come up with the right words, so that we do not have a response from him

[Levi's Introduction - Critiqued by Slottow and Revised by all Editors on March 12, 2020]

Levi's introduction

Stephen Slottow Thu, Mar 12, 1:03 AM

As we discussed before, Levi, for all his virtues, is not a good writer of English prose. Most of that introduction is embarrassingly pretentious and sophomoric.

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mon, Mar 9, 1:45 PM

to Stephen, Benjamin, me

Hi all,

Alright, thanks! Dr. Jackson, we'll get a final typeset version of the response to you later today. Dr. Slottow, we'll add whatever alteration you wish to make, so just send the new version later today. On the subject of the intro, we are writing it and will send it to both of you today or tomorrow. Dr. Graf and I feel that it is best to keep it short and sweet, as we wish to let the various responses speak for themselves. But it won't go to print without your input. Thanks!

Regards,
Levi Walls

Subject: Re: [EXT] Final version
Symposium Bibliography, March 11, 2020
Symposium bibliography
Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Wed, Mar 11, 6:54 PM
to Levi, Stephen, Benjamin

Dear Levi, with Ben and Stephen on copy,
You have done an excellent job with the bibliography. The Politics of the Umlaut in Schenker's....I think *Umlaut* should be italicized. It is still a foreign word even though in common usage in music theory. Paperson, Ia. 2017. A Third University Is Possible. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Something is wrong here. Paperson is the last name, is there a first name? Also, what does 1a refer to? Pellegrin, Rich. Is it Richard or Rich? Could you please add these items:....
Pellegrin, Rich. Is it Richard or Rich?

Timothy Jackson

Wed, Mar 11, 8:31 PM
OK. Got it!

Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Wed, Mar 11, 8:48 PM
to Benjamin, Levi, me
Levi,

I'm attaching a short list of items that have either been left out or that need alteration (in my opinion).

-sps

Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Wed, Mar 11, 8:50 PM
to Levi, Benjamin, me

I don't know, but in the introduction I'd mention that it is a combined bibliography for all the articles.

-sps

Agree.
Reply
allForward

[More Final Editing on March 10 and 11, 2020 – Jackson accepted colleagues' corrections, including Ben and Levi]

Ewell Response

final proof

Inbox x
schenker <schenker@unt.edu>

Tue, Mar 10, 6:01 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Please find attached the typesetting of your response. Thanks!

Regards,

Levi Walls

Attachments area

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 10, 9:58AM

to Stephen, Benjamin, Levi, schenker

Dear Colleagues,

Just a few small corrections to my response listed below.

The more I consider it, the less sure I am whether to capitalize "Classical" throughout. I understand the reader's concern, but I believe it could be either way. What do you think?

Since Jack Boss refers to my comment by page numbers, I should probably do the same. Do you agree? Since Stephen Slottow addresses that issue (see pp.) as Barry Wiener shows (see pp.) Given his student Hans Weisse's (please add the words in bold since this is the *first* mention of Weisse).

Now, "With prescience, [cut: Schenker's student Hans] Weisse decided to emigrate to America already in the late 1920s because of anti-Semitism." "Furtwängler appeared, and [cut: Schenker's student] Weisse"

Footnote 1, " *The Atlantic* COMMA December 5, 2016, Ewell implies that the passages that Oster and Allen [replace with Forte] exiled to appendices «the Jews» Why not ordinary quotation marks?

Footnote 4. In Dennis HerdAPOSTROPHES

I think that is it!

Great proofs! Bravo!

Tim

Stephen Slottow <sslottow@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 10, 10:38AM

to schenker, Benjamin, Levi, me

While we're doing corrections, I'll add that, clever though it be, comparing ethnomusicologists to giant beetles could be taken as both unfortunate and uncollegial. I'll get my corrections to you by tomorrow morning.
-sps

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 10, 10:46 AM

to Stephen, schenker, Benjamin, Levi

My dear Stephen,

Not beetles but beetles.

But just one beetle. LOL.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Tue, Mar 10, 11:18 AM to me, Stephen, schenker
, Benjamin

From: Timothy Jackson

<shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, March 10,
2020 8:46 AM

To: Stephen Slottow

<sslottow@gmail.com>

Cc: schenker <schenker@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Walls,
Levi

Stephen Slottow <sslottow@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 10, 11:25AM

to me

Thanks for the correction. But my observation still stands. It is up to you, however.
-sps

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 10, 11:26 AM

to Stephen

I would like to keep it that way. But perhaps it is best understood as a pun.

Stephen Slottow <sslottow@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 10, 11:34AM

to me

OK. But how could it be understood as a pun? (P.S. I can't find the final version any more. Would you send me the last par.?)

Stephen Slottow <sslottow@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 10, 12:31 PM

to Benjamin, Levi, me

I don't see a pun. I see a clever analogy between Kafka's beetle and ethnomusicologists. I like it, but it ain't diplomatic and, in these hysterical times, could be seized upon as an example of intolerance and chauvinism by those who are looking for such examples (Ewell, for instance). Most of the response is excellent and valuable. Is it good to end it in this way?

-sps

Graf@unt.edu>

Tue, Mar 10, 12:44PM

to Stephen, me, Levi

Colleagues,

I second Stephen's concerns about that portion. Tim, you make an excellent point with the beetle, but I admit that when I read it I was also a bit hesitant on what others might say/cite later.

Ben

Benjamin Graf, Ph.D.

University of North Texas

Music History, Theory and Ethnomusicology

Office: MU215

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 10, 2:10 PM

to Stephen, Benjamin, Levi

OK, here is a thought. Just cut the two words "as ethnomusicologists." That preserves the sense of my metaphor, but makes it hit the intended target, which is not ethnomusicologists, but *music theorists*: In other words, by divorcing ourselves from the detailed investigation of the structure of pieces within the canon - which now, because deemed elitist, becomes obsolete - we will all wake up one morning soon, just like the protagonist of Kafka's *Metamorphosis*, who found himself a giant beetle. I think that solves the problem.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Tue, Mar 10, 2:40PM

to Stephen, me, Benjamin
Alright, will do!
- Levi Walls

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 10, 2:50 PM

to Stephen, Levi, Benjamin

[*Another professor*] just sent me some detailed comments. I need some time to review them. They are mostly small nuances. I will let you know by this evening what, if anything, I need to change or modify.

Best, Tim

Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>

Tue, Mar 10, 3:17PM

to me

Not meaning to be difficult, I'm sure, but I don't think it does. It doesn't make sense as stands. "by divorcing ourselves from the...we will all wake up one morning soon, just like the protagonist..." Well, of course, if we're not dead or in a coma, we'll all wake up one morning soon. But that's not news. You're just saying that we'll wake up in the morning. That question is wake up as what or to what? Before it made sense—"as ethnomusicologists."

Now it doesn't. Wake up to a world in which...? Wake up as a...? Wake up as..." You can't just what or to what? Before it made sense—"as ethnomusicologists."

Now it doesn't. Wake up to a world in which...? Wake up as a...? Wake up as..." You can't just remove "ethnomusicologists," you have to replace it with something, or restructure the sentence, or abandon the metaphor. It doesn't work as stands. Before, it did work, but was politically...inadvisable?

-sps

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 10, 7:43 PM

to Stephen

I am thinking what to do about it.

Walls,Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Wed, Mar 11, 9:01AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

I have attached the new version of your response. I went ahead and uncapitalized "classical." I'll send the combined bibliography to you and Dr. Slottow in a bit. Thanks!

Regards,
Levi Walls

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Wed, Mar 11, 9:18AM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Can you please insert the page number references in my response to Stephen Slottow's and Barry Wiener's responses respectively. I will keep reading.

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Wed, Mar 11, 9:20 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Oh, I forgot to mention. I'm waiting for Dr. Slottow to send me his updated version.

Until then, I can't know the page numbers of his or anyone after for sure. I will make sure to put those in once I get that.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 7:18 AM

To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Subject: Re: [EXT] Re: Final version

Timothy Jackson Wed, Mar 11, 9:22 AM

OK. I see. But there are other corrections still missing. I will send shortly.

Walls, Levi Wed, Mar 11, 9:30 AM

Ah, sorry about that. Along with those corrections that you send, I will make sure to italicize appropriate titles in the footnotes. Indesign likes to unitalicize.

Walls, Levi Wed, Mar 11, 9:42 AM

And I fixed footnote 2, which also mysteriously disappeared.

Timothy Jackson Wed, Mar 11, 11:23 AM

Dear Levi, Going through it line by line, I found that some of my earlier corrections were not made, and I have added one or two more corrections.

Walls, Levi Wed, Mar 11, 11:34 AM

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Ah, right. Completely forgot those earlier corrections. I'll go through and address all of these things. Sorry, somewhat poor showing from me

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Mar 11, 2020, 11:35 AM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I am not worried. I know that you are capable. We are all human, unfortunately.

Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Wed, Mar 11, 2:47PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Last thing before I send it back. In your new footnote, it looks like some of the things are in bold, but it's hard to tell with the red font. Did you wanted bolded phrases? If so, could you resend in black text? Thanks!

Regards,

Levi Walls

Walls, Levi Mar 11, 2020, 6:32 PM

Thanks. Alright, I have it written down at my desk and I'll do it as soon as Dr. Slottow's response comes in. I'm going to send you an updated bibliography.

On Feb 5, 2020, at 10:30 AM, schenker wrote:

Hi Barry, Congratulations! We like your response and would be happy to include it in the upcoming JSS, with the possibility of some revisions. We've included some comments on your response that you may wish to address. It is not a "must change" situation, but merely some suggested things to think about. We were also thinking that you might do more to structure your arguments in order to more easily guide the reader. Perhaps some transition sentences and a clearer statement in the introduction of the issues you seek to address. With the short time requirement, combined with the 3000 word limit, it's understandable that those conveniences weren't the priority. We can give you a week to make any changes you think appropriate (by midnight on Feb 12) and, of course, feel free to email me about questions/concerns you may have. Don't worry about the 3000 limit as you make any adjustments, just try to keep it under or near 4000 and it will be fine. Thanks very much! Regards, Levi Walls

From: schenker <schenker@unt.edu> Subject: Re: [EXT] Ewell article questions Date: February 9, 2020 at 12:06 PM To: Barry Wiener <bwiener8@icloud.com> Cc: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Hi Barry, Thanks for your email! No, we'd like you to be free to address any topics that you feel are germane to the discussion. I forgot to mention before that you may decide to tweak the title of the response (Philip Ewell's White Racial Frame). From our discussions with various people, we've noticed a misconception that the term "white racial frame" is a novel concept invented by Ewell. This confusion is due in part to Ewell's failure to clarify where he was deriving his terminology. But it's a term in use within critical race and gender studies that was coined by sociologist Joe Feagin in 2006. You're likely already aware of the term's history, but considering the apparent misconception, it may be worthwhile to

rethink the title. But you can also keep it as is, if you prefer. Thanks! Regards, Levi Walls
From: Barry Wiener Sent: Friday, February 7, 2020 5:27:02 PM To: schenker Subject: Re: [EXT] Ewell article questions
Dear Levi and Benjamin, I thought some of your suggestions were very helpful. I just was concerned, not that you were trying to censor me, but that you feel that professional considerations require that you set limits on the topics addressed in the responses. I'll get back to you in a few days. Thanks, Barry
On Feb 6, 2020, at 7:47 AM, schenker

[Editing Symposium Introduction among the board advisory, March 12, 2020]

Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Thu, Mar 12, 12:56 AM
to Benjamin, Levi,
me

Dear Levi and Ben,
I just looked at the introduction, and have a few comments, as follows. Most of these are my opinions, and the rest of you may differ, of course.
-Don't entitle my contribution "Ewell Response"--that's just the name of the file. Call it "An Initial Response to Philip Ewell."
-My overall reaction to the introduction is that far too much of it comes off as self consciously pompous and, frankly, sophomoric. I think it needs to have the rosy foggy vistas trimmed and become more sober and direct. For instance:
-"Symposium"? Well, I guess that's OK, but why not simply call it "Responses to Philip....". Isn't that more accurate and less hifalutin'?
-I don't really like "is proud." How about "is pleased"?
-"Indeed, academic discourse is the lifeblood of philosophical inquiry...? That's exactly the kind of thing I'm talking about. It's inflated and pretentious. First, cut "indeed." Then cut the rest of it. Just leave it as "No field or methodology stands to prosper or develop without such debates."
Perhaps the following:
The *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* is publishing the following responses to Philip Ewell's SMT 2019 plenary presentation, "Music Theory's White Racial Frame." As the co-editors of an academic journal whose mission it is to encourage the exchange of ideas, we are pleased that these responses express a variety of thoughts and perspectives. No field or methodology stands to prosper or develop without such debates. The *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* holds no official stance regarding the issues addressed by the following responses.
-sps

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Thu, Mar 12, 10:23 AM

to Stephen, me, Benjamin
Hi Dr. Slottow, et al.,
I'll make sure to change the title in the intro. Please make sure to send the updated version of your response today so we can finish the layout of the journal. And thanks for your comments, your honesty is much appreciated!

Regards,
Levi Walls

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 12, 12:44PM

to Stephen, Benjamin, Levi

Dear Colleagues,

Building on Stephen's comment, I would like to propose the following. "Indeed, academic discourse is the lifeblood of philosophical inquiry, and no field or methodology stands to prosper or develop without such debates" might be revised to read:

"Informed debate is the lifeblood of scholarly inquiry, and a field or methodology, such as music theory, stands to prosper by interrogating and critiquing itself." I think that the point comes off better when phrased positively.

What do you all think of that?

Best wishes,

Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Thu, Mar 12, 12:56PM

to me, Stephen, Benjamin

Hi all,

That sounds fine. I was also thinking we could say "essence" instead of "lifeblood."

Regards,
Levi Walls

Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>

Thu, Mar 12, 1:03 PM

to Levi, me, Benjamin

I'm not sure it IS the essence. I think I prefer lifeblood.

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 12, 1:03 PM

to Stephen, Levi, Benjamin

Yes, "essence" works well if not better than "lifeblood."

If we all agree, then I think the sentence is positive rather than pompous, and accurate, and that the introduction is done. Please take out "Anonymous I," and just make it "Anonymous." "Anonymous I" is funny, but perhaps this is the wrong place for humor. Are we done with everything and ready to submit?

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 12, 1:04 PM

to Stephen

Dear Stephen,

I'll let you argue out "lifeblood" vs "essence" with Ben and Levi. I can live with either! Did you add your conclusion?

Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu> Thu, Mar 12, 1:07PM

to me

Can we read the full revised statement?

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Thu, Mar 12, 1:07PM

to Benjamin, me, Stephen

Alright, I'll change the intro and use "Anonymous." The only thing I'm missing is Dr. Slottow's updated response. I just have the version from last week. Everything else has been sent to Karen, who is starting to look through the materials.

- Levi Walls

[Final addition on March 12, 2020 Between Levi Walls and Jackson]

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 12, 9:19PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I am sorry to burden you with this, but will do so anyway! I hope that it might still be possible to make one last addition to my conclusion without throwing the train off the track. Could you please insert the few sentences indicated in red in the final paragraph, and one last footnote. I think that the point is significantly important to try to make it, albeit just before the train leaves the station!

Although we now live in an era of "alternative facts," I believe that demagoguery and intellectual dishonesty must not go unanswered. We have seen what occurs when this happens on a massive scale, with catastrophic results in the 20th century, and now again in our own time. I was not present when Ewell spoke at the SMT plenary session, but I heard about the standing ovation he received, which, to my mind, is just as worrying as his talk itself. The warm reception, the applause that Ewell earned there, is as outrageous and dangerous as the contents of his speech, and bespeaks the sorry state of the field of music theory generally these days. Schenkerians of the different pedagogical schools have always "decoupled" ideological claims from music theoretical approaches. Furthermore, not only did Schenker's own ideas about politics and race evolve considerably (as I have shown), so did his analytical methodology (as Pastille, Bent, and others have amply documented). Looking back, at least two generations of

Schenkerians have explored and critiqued the evolutions of both aspects. For example, what a tremendous transformation there is between Schenker's early and later ideas about just the particular issue of organicism; the same holds true for his views of race, which also changed dramatically![] Ewell assures us that Schenker would have objected to "decoupling" his philosophical, historical, political, racial, and other ideas from his music theory. But is this claim really as self-evident as it might initially seem, since the question then becomes: which philosophical-historical-political ideas cannot be disassociated from which stages of music-theoretical development, given the very significant advances in both dimensions? Therefore, even Schenker himself must have recognized, especially late in his career, not only the possibility, but the absolute necessity of such decoupling. Some would like to demolish the classical canon of "Bach-to-Brahms," falsely claiming it to be exclusively a "white male" elitist meritocracy, and arguing that we should replace it with putatively egalitarian pop, hip-hop, punk, and world musics. This is a mischaracterization because the great tradition of classical music includes Black, Jewish, and female composers, and remains, as Schenker ultimately recognized, an "elitism of the hearing of the spirit, not of race." A colleague recently wondered - given the apparent current lack of focus on "the notes" of complete pieces within the Bach-to-Brahms canon (unfortunately, also a concept associated with Schenkerian analysis) - if we music theorists were not now metamorphosing into non-theorists. In other words, by divorcing ourselves from the detailed investigation of the structure of pieces within the canon - which now, because deemed elitist, becomes obsolete - we will all wake up one morning soon, just like the protagonist of Kafka's *Metamorphosis*, who found himself a giant beetle. But, perhaps, just as Schenker finally saw the light, albeit late in life, we music theorists will eventually also come to our senses.

In all cases, better late than never.

[] William Pastille, "Heinrich Schenker, Anti-Organicist," *19th-Century Music*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Summer, 1984), pp. 29-36.

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Thu, Mar 12, 9:39PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

No worries, I still have to put the page numbers for Slottow and Wiener into your response, anyway. As soon as I have Dr. Slottow's response, I will know the page numbers for sure, and will be able to cite them in yours. So I will add these sentences while I am at it. And all the other changes were incorporated as well. Dr. Slottow may have a point about the Kafka reference. I can see some of our ethnomusicologist colleagues taking it the wrong way. It's up to you, of course, but it may be better to frame that last point in a more positive way. Perhaps, instead of placing a value judgement on ethnomusicology, you might consider framing the issue in terms of there being a good reason that theory, musicology, and ethnomusicology are different fields, because ethnomusicology, you might consider framing the issue in terms of there being a good reason that theory, musicology, and ethnomusicology are different fields, because they have different aims. In other words, the three branches are

separate but equal (for lack of a phrase without such baggage), and equilibrium will only result in a less diverse range of perspectives.

But, again, you could go either way.

Regards,
Levi Walls

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Thu, Mar 12, 10:03PM

to me

I've added the new sentences. I'm just waiting for those page numbers now. As soon as I get Dr. Slottow's response, I'll add the page numbers for Slottow and Wiener. As you previously specified I'll format it like so: "Since Stephen Slottow addresses that issue (pp. x-x)..." "Furthermore, as Barry Wiener shows (pp. xx)..."

- Levi Walls

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 12, 10:15PM

to Levi

Great!

By the way, I added you to my Skype contacts! So that way, we can talk if needed.

Best, Tim

[Correspondence concerning the final proofs going to press, March 13, 2020]

All of the responses were read by Ben Graf, Levi Walls, Stephen Slottow, and Karen at UNT press. If there were further concerns about expressions of "racism" or other issues, they were not expressed.

Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>

Mar 13, 2020, 8:24 PM

to Levi, Stephen, me

Colleagues,

I responded to Tim's inquiry but only to Levi (by mistake). I collected bios and contributor agreement forms together so we will get them shortly! Thank you for the reminder Tim!

Best,

Ben

Benjamin Graf, Ph.D.

University of North Texas

Music History, Theory and Ethnomusicology

Office: MU215

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 13, 7:50 AM

to Benjamin, Levi, Stephen

Dear Levi and Ben,

It seems like we are ready to go. Might it be possible to see proofs of the entire Ewell response section for one final check before it goes to press?

Best wishes,

Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Fri, Mar 13, 9:39AM

to Stephen, me, Benjamin

Hi all,

Sure, I'll send the files in a bit. I'm just double checking page numbers.

Karen is also looking over them, as she always does before it goes to print, so we'll have an extra line of defense (though I don't really intend us to need one, but you never know).

Regards,

Levi Walls

[Suggestions on Slottow's Conclusion on March 13, 2020]

Your conclusion

Inbox x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 12, 8:09 PM to Stephen

Dear Stephen,

The conclusion definitely strengthens and rounds out the piece.

"Schenker may have believed at some points in his evolution? that his political and racial beliefs were indistinguishable from his music theory and analytical methodology, but his successors haven't agreed, finding something very valuable in the latter but not in the former."

You might mention, in a footnote to this sentence, your article on teaching lines, where Schenkerians of the quite different branches have nevertheless always decoupled ideological claims from music theoretical approach. Furthermore, not only did Schenker's own ideas about politics and race evolve considerably (as I show), so did his analytical methodology (as Pastille, Bent, and others have demonstrated). Looking back, Schenkerians have explored and critiqued the evolutions of both. For example,

Heinrich Schenker, *Anti-Organicist*

William A. Pastille

19th-Century Music

Vol. 8, No. 1 (Summer, 1984), pp. 29-36.

What a tremendous evolution between Schenker's early and late ideas about just

this particular issue of organicism, and the same for his views of race! Ewell assures us that Schenker would have objected to "decoupling" his philosophical, historical, political, racial, and other ideas from his music theory. But is that claim about Schenker as self-evident as it might seem, since the question then becomes *which* philosophical-historical-political ideas cannot be decoupled from which stage of his music theoretical development, given the significant changes in both dimensions? Might you mention this?

However, in this important sentence: "Citing similar language in statements about politics and race on the one hand, and tonal function and the *Ursatz* on the other, suggests a false equivalence, the "will of the tones" notwithstanding.

I do not understand what you mean here by the qualification, "the "will of the tones" notwithstanding." Could you please explain.

Footnote 12 is missing a quotation mark: [1] William Rothstein, "The Americanization of Heinrich Schenker." In Hedi Siegel, ed., *Schenker Studies*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1990: 193-203.

Stephen Slottow <sslottow@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 13, 3:48 AM

to me

Tim,

Thank you for your timely critique.

I've implemented many of your points. See comments in bold.

"Furthermore, not only did Schenker's own ideas about politics and race evolve considerably (as I show), so did his analytical methodology (as Pastille, Bent, and others have demonstrated)." What is the Bent reference?

"What a tremendous evolution between Schenker's early and late ideas about just this particular issue of organicism, and the same for his views of race! Ewell assures us that Schenker would have objected to "decoupling" his philosophical, historical, political, racial, and other ideas from his music theory. But is that claim about Schenker as self-evident as it might seem, since the question then becomes *which* philosophical-historical-political ideas cannot be decoupled from which stage of his music theoretical development, given the significant changes in both dimensions? Might you mention this?" I'm thinking about this.

It's an important point, but I don't see how I can just "mention" it without laying it out in some detail--and that would take more research and writing than there is time for now. If SMT accepts it I'll devote time to making this point. I have made the point that neither Schenker's historical/political/etc. views nor his music theory/analytical methodology were static. I refer to your response for the former, but I need a good reference for the latter. That's why I'm asking about the Bent ref.

"However, in this important sentence: "Citing similar language in statements about politics and race on the one hand, and tonal function and the *Ursatz* on the other, suggests a false equivalence, the "will of the tones" notwithstanding. I do not understand what you mean here by the qualification, "the "will of the tones" notwithstanding." Could you please explain." I was making a sort of pun that, despite the "will of the tones" (Tonville), equating statements about tones

with statements about people can only go so far. I've deleted that bit.
By the way, how does one, I wonder, handle attendance in online teaching? Or take questions? Or should attendance even count any more?
-sps

[More Corrections on Pomeroy and Pellegrin on March 13, 2020]

Pomeroy corrections

Timothy Jackson Fri, Mar 13, 5:56 PM

Dear Levi, In Pomeroy,

Der Dreiklang needs to be italicized, both as a foreign expression and as the title of a journal. In this sentence, albeit within parenthesis.

Walls, Levi Fri, Mar 13, 6:46 PM

That's good. Fixing now. Though I let a few things slip by, considering the sheer volume of things I fixed in all the responses, I'm satisfied that only a thing

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sent: Friday, March 13, 2020 4:46 PM

To: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: [EXT] Pomeroy corrections

2 Attachments

Thanks!

Done. Looks good.

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Fri, Mar 13, 6:46 PM

to me

That's good. Fixing now. Though I let a few things slip by, considering the sheer volume of things I fixed in all the responses, I'm satisfied that only a thing here and there was wrong. Karen will also be having a go at these before they go to print, just in case. Also, the Wiener response has an incorrect date in it ("2109") but I've already changed it to 2019.

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 13, 5:37 PM

to Levi, Benjamin, Stephen

Dear Colleagues,

I read through Pellegrin's contribution, and found only one small thing: "America's classical music"; place quotation mark outside semicolon

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Fri, Mar 13, 5:42 PM
to Stephen, me, Benjamin

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Fri, Mar 13, 5:42PM
to Stephen, me, Benjamin
Fixed!
- Levi Walls

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Mar 13, 2020, 5:56 PM
to me, Benjamin, Stephen
Oh, and I'm attaching the Segall response, which I think was actually just Wiener again in the version I sent you. I'm just having trouble exporting it right this minute. So it should show up in a little bit.

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2020 3:41 PM
To: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: [EXT] Pellegrin
Fixed!
- Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2020 3:37 PM
To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Subject: [EXT] Pellegrin
Dear Colleagues,

I read through Pellegrin's contribution, and found only one small thing:
"America's classical music"; place quotation mark outside semicolon

Timothy Jackson Mar 13, 2020, 6:01 PM
No, I got Segall, and will look through it tonight. Did you make all of the not insignificant corrections to Slottow? I am unsure whether I received the correct

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Mar 13, 2020, 6:03 PM
to me
Haha. That must have been it.
I did make those changes to Dr. Slottow's shortly after he brought them up. I sent

it to him and he confirmed that it looked good. But I will attach it for you if you'd like to see.

- Levi Walls

Timothy Jackson Mar 13, 2020, 6:04 PM

Yes, I should eyeball it once to see if there are any small issues.

Walls, Levi Mar 13, 2020, 6:05 PM

Sure thing. Thanks for the extra set of eyes!

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday,

March 13, 2020 4:04 PM

Timothy Jackson Mar 13, 2020, 6:06 PM

Just between us, I like Pelligrin's response, which I find thoughtful and intelligent. I understand Clark's point, but she completely misconstrues and misunderstands Schenkerian analysis.

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mar 13, 2020, 6:26 PM

to me

I quite liked his as well. Rich and I discussed his response when I sent notes. I had suggested some minor rhetorical additions that better connects the defense of hierarchy to Ewell's ideas (in the middle, some time goes by without mentioning Ewell). But he expressed a discomfort toward pushing back too much against Ewell *specifically* because he didn't want his response to be misconstrued as racist. Of course, I said that I understood and it was entirely up to him. It would have been nice if he had included a refutation of Agawu's Schubert argument (as mentioned in Clark); but I couldn't have suggested that to him, because I would have been stacking the deck against Clark. And I'm meant to be impartial.

Yes, the idea that Schenkerian analysis inherently ignores parts of an analysis that don't fit into the fundamental structure is a severe misunderstanding. The focal point of many good graphs is how works *don't* adhere to that structure; if the goal was always simply "let's show how this piece expresses the *Ursatz*" (as many non-Schenkerian believe), such an analysis would most likely be unnuanced and boring.

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, March 13, 2020 4:06 PM

To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Subject: Re: [EXT] Pellegrin

Could you make one last addition to mine

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Fri, Mar 13, 3:50 PM
to Levi

Dear Levi,

One last addition to my conclusion, indicated in blue. Also, could you please put the "which" indicated in blue in italics.

For example, what a tremendous transformation there was between Schenker's early and later ideas about just the particular issue of organicism; the same holds true for his views of race, which also changed dramatically! [i] Schenker's critics assume that his cultural-political ideas were immutable, but in fact they were not: just as there were u-turns in the rapid developments in his analytical methodology and his readings of specific pieces, so too they occur in the ideological realm in his transformation from anti-organicist to organicist, racist to non-racist, etc.. To call attention to just one further striking example, Schenker's perception of the United States evolved significantly in his last years. For most of his life, Schenker had held America and Americans in low esteem, as is evidenced from the quotation given above and many other comments until the later 1920s. However, after Weisse emigrated to America in 1931 and began sending Schenker reports about the enthusiastic reception of his theory there, and especially after *Five Analyses in Sketchform* was published by the David Mannes Music School in 1933 with an English translation of Schenker's introduction, the great theorist's opinion of America became decidedly more positive! Ewell assures us that Schenker would have objected to "decoupling" his philosophical, historical, political, racial, and other ideas from his music theory. But is this claim, even if true, really as selfevident as it might initially seem, since the question then becomes: *which* philosophical-historical-political ideas cannot be decoupled from which stages of music-theoretical development, given the very significant evolutions in both dimensions?

Then the last paragraph should start here:

Some would like to demolish the classical canon of "Bach-to-Brahms," falsely claiming it to be exclusively a "white male" elitist meritocracy, and arguing that we should replace it with putatively egalitarian pop, hip-hop, punk, and world musics. This is a mischaracterization because the great tradition of classical music includes Black, Jewish, and female composers, and remains, as Schenker ultimately recognized, an "elitism of the hearing of the spirit, not of race." A colleague recently wondered - given the apparent current lack of focus on "the notes" of complete pieces within the Bach-to-Brahms canon (unfortunately, also a concept associated with Schenkerian analysis) - if we music theorists were not now metamorphosing into non-theorists. In other words, by divorcing ourselves from the detailed investigation of the structure of pieces within the canon - which now, because deemed elitist, becomes obsolete - we will all wake up one morning soon, just like the protagonist of Kafka's *Metamorphosis*, who found himself a giant beetle. But, perhaps, just as Schenker finally saw the light, albeit late in life, we music theorists will eventually also come to our senses. In all cases, better late than never.

William Pastille, "Heinrich Schenker, Anti-Organicist," *19th-Century Music*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Summer, 1984), pp. 29-36.

[Correspondence between the board, Alan Cadwallader, Berry Wiener, Mar. 14-24, 2020]

In the end, Cadwallader submitted his response.

Important-- JSS Contributor Agreement Form schenker <schenker@unt.edu>

Sat, Mar 14, 9:00 PM

to Benjamin, me, Stephen, Levi

Dear JSS authors and advisory board,

As we put the finishing touches on volume 12 of our journal, I ask all contributors to reply (not reply all) with the following items within the next few business days:

- 1) Signed and dated contributor agreement form (see attached)
- 2) Current mailing address (for the distribution of your print copy)
- 3) Short bio for the "contributors" section (only 2-4 sentences please)

Levi Walls has done excellent work on this volume and the journal will be in good hands as he takes over sole editorship of the JSS. In my view, the additional content that we collected this winter following Ewell's SMT plenary makes a great addition to an already remarkable publication. Later this week, Levi will take on some additional responsibilities, so I will be keeping track of these forms and publisher information. All three items should be fairly simple to return, so thank you in advance for your prompt attention to these items.

Cheers to getting this to press!

Sincerely,

Ben Graf

Attachments area

Stephen Lett Tue, Mar 17, 2:07 PM

Dear Ben (and board),

Cheers! I am attaching my signed contributor agreement. My address is: 114 Elliott Ave Apt 203 Charlottesville, VA 22902

My bio is: Stephe

schenker <schenker@unt.edu>

Fri, Mar 20, 4:15 PM

to Allen, me, Stephen

Allen,

I hope this message finds you well. Is there any way that you could write a one or two sentence permission to print your contribution? UNT Press has approved my request for simpler, electronic written permissions during this time.

I think I can speak for all of us when I say that we would hate to see your section excluded! I include Tim and Stephen on carbon copy if they would like to echo my sentiments.

Please advise how we should proceed.
Best,
Ben

From: Allen Cadwallader <cadwallader78@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 9:02 PM
To: schenker <schenker@unt.edu>
Subject: [EXT] Re: Important-- JSS Contributor Agreement Form
I'm sorry I'm not in a position to do all of this right now. Please exclude my contribution from the volume
On Sat, Mar 14, 2020 at 10:00 PM schenker <schenker@unt.edu> wrote:
...

Barry Wiener Tue, Mar 24, 3:18 AM
Dear Tim and Ben, I just reread my article. If possible, I hope you can make two last-minute changes/adjustments. If it's too late, I will understand. p. 197, c

schenker
Tue, Mar 24, 6:59 PM
Dear Barry,
We'll be submitting the journal to the press later this evening (pending the tying up of one final loose end) so I went ahead and made those two cha

Barry Wiener <bwiener8@icloud.com>
Tue, Mar 24, 7:13PM
to schenker, me
Dear Levi,
Thanks. I just checked it.
I hope that everything is going well with you and your family.
All best,
Barry
2 Attachments
Support for you
Inbox

[More Corrections among Wiener, Jackson, and Levi Walls, March 13-14, 2020]

There are very collegial discussions/exchanges about some responses with Levi Walls.

Re: [EXT] More corrections
schenker <schenker@unt.edu>
Sat, Mar 14, 9:11 AM
to Barry, me

Hi Barry,
Thanks, I'll address all of these changes (including in yours and Slottow's).
Regards,
Levi Walls

From: Barry Wiener <bw Wiener8@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 12:28:18 AM
To: schenker <schenker@unt.edu>
Subject: [EXT] More corrections

Dear Levi,
Here are some small errors that I noted in the articles:

Beach

p. 127 I was taught very old-fashioned (non-musical) theory [What does this mean?]

p. 127 I, for one, would welcome into the analytical canon words [works] by both black and women composers.

Boss

p. 132 It seems to me that one of Allen Forte's priorities as a practitioner [practitioner] of Schenkerian analysis was to use the method to illustrate the genius of musicians who wrote in popular styles

Cadwallader

p. 136, note 5

"We stand before a Herculaneum and Pompeii of music! All musical culture is buried; the very tonal material—that foundation of music which artists, transcending the spare clue provided by the overtone series, created anew in all respects from within [within] themselves—is demolished."

p. 137: Notes 7, 8, and 9 are missing.

Anonymous, p. 200

What I do know is this: that the historical context is of upmost [utmost] importance for a topic like this.

For Schenker to have not, at some point, hold [held] those beliefs would be truly exceptional.

All best,

Barry

schenker <schenker@unt.edu>

Mar 14, 2020, 9:47 AM

to Barry, me

Alright, and these are fixed. Luckily, we'd already caught a few of them. Thanks so much for the extra set of eyes! Just let me know about Lād in your article and we should be good to go.

- Levi Walls

From: schenker <schenker@unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 9:11 AM

To: Barry Wiener <bwiener8@icloud.com>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: [EXT] More corrections

Hi Barry,
Thanks, I'll address all of these changes (including in yours and Slottow's).
Regards,
Levi Walls

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)
Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Mar 14, 2020, 10:41 AM

to Levi, schenker

Dear Levi,

Beach p. 127 "I was taught very old-fashioned (non-musical) theory"

In the Beach, this is NOT a mistake, even though Barry queried it. Beach is being sarcastic, and referring to the Roman numeral labeling type of music theory that is still widely taught. So please don't touch that!

I assume that we collectively have caught everything now. I have to be honest that I was too "turned off" by Segall to go through his response. Barry did read it through carefully and found nothing wrong, so I am willing to trust him on that.

Ben says that he has requested short bios from all contributors. We need to proof those too. I need to send you a couple of sentences - right? Also Stephen Slottow. Don't forget to ask him.

I appreciate your own comment about Clark. Of all of the more supportive comments for Ewell, I find Clark's the most interesting, and also the most worthy of careful and systematic rebuttal. I understand why she thinks as she does, and I would like to explain why her two main hypotheses are misguided, both about the inter-relationship between Schenker's ideas and ideology and his analytical technique and his putative "exclusion" of certain musical features in the song analyses. Re. the first, Clark (like Ewell) incorrectly wants to freeze Schenker's ideological positions in order to reject them, when they were in flux and metamorphosed into their opposites. I think that I made this point in my response: so "which" ideological position reasonably be inextricably aligned with "which" part of the analytical technique? But the most important and interesting part of her response - to me at least - concerns her point about "exclusion." Ironically, Schenker's putative exclusion of these important musical aspects - which is no exclusion at all - tells us more about their impact on the structure and semantics of these Lieder than her seeming valorization of them ever could! I need to unpack this point.

Best wishes, and thank-you for your hard work!

Tim

**[Updated files put together into a single PDF and printing timeline on March 14, 2020]
-discussions among Levi Walls, Slottow, Graf, and Jackson]**

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sat, Mar 14, 4:55 PM

to me, Stephen, Benjamin

Hi all,

Using all the updated versions of articles, I've put everything together with accurate layout (so that new items begin on odd pages, as per house style) and page numbers (and pp. citations in Jackson and Boss have been updated). Please find this file attached.

In just a minute, I will send updated PDFs of separate articles to their respective authors, asking them to (once more) confirm that their contribution is to their specifications. Just to be sure.

Our current timeline looks like this: Dr. Graf is contacting authors with contributor agreements and a request for a short (2–3 sentence) bio. Those will be coming in a few days. Karen says she will finish her own proofreading by the end of this coming week. If Karen has any corrections that need to be made, Dr. Graf and I will quickly make those changes. After that, we should be about ready to go. So, in conclusion, printing should occur around March 23rd. Dr. Graf, does this sound about right?

Thanks for your work, everyone!

Regards,
Levi Walls

...

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mar 14, 2020, 5:51 PM

to Benjamin, Stephen, me

I'm doing it now so we can see what it looks like and compare. I'll send when I'm done.

- Levi Walls

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 3:43:50 PM

To: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: [EXT] Re: Updated files put together into a single PDF and printing timeline

...

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mar 14, 2020, 6:15PM

to Benjamin, Stephen,

me

Alright. What do we think of this? I did it quickly, so I'll need to double check it, but as a sample, do we like it better? Again, I'm okay with either.

- Levi Walls

Attachments area

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Mar 14, 2020, 6:27 PM

to Levi, Benjamin, Stephen

Personally, I think that it is really much better this way. Then we don't need a separate table of contents later, which is awkward.

On the front cover, it should say, "With contributions by....." these authors, and list the names in alphabetical order.

At the end, it should say BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE RESPONSES

Tim

Timothy Jackson Mar 14, 2020, 6:29 PM

First Proof of Volume 12.

Timothy Jackson<shermanzelechin@gmail.com> wrote: First Proof of Volume 12.

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mar 14, 2020, 7:44 PM

to Benjamin, Stephen, me

Hi all,

Okay, here is a version that has the "Bibliography for the Responses" in the ToC.

I've also changed the "Introduction to Symposium on..." to have no list of authors (as we now have that part in the ToC). I also changed the heading for the final Bibliography to "Bibliography to the Responses."

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 4:27 PM

To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Cc: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>

Mar 14, 2020, 8:05 PM

to Levi, Benjamin, me

I agree with Tim that each response should have it's on page numbers. But other changes should be made:

Symposium [or SYMPOSIUM] on Philip Ewell's SMT 2019 Plenary Paper, "Music Theory's White Racial Frame" should stand by itself, since it is the title to the concluding section of the issue.

Then "Introduction" [NOT "intro"] should be the first item of the symposium. I think that probably all of the items of the symposium (except the main heading) should be indented a bit so that they are clearly and graphically shown to be parts of and under the main heading: "Symposium for Philip...."

As it is now, there is a confusion of levels--really! The main heading is a middleground event, so to speak, and each item of the symposium is a foreground event that composes out the middleground event.

CONTRIBUTORS should not be indented, since it is not a subhead of the symposium.

-sps

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mar 14, 2020, 9:21 PM

to Stephen, Benjamin, me

Levels addressed. In past volumes, names of authors have been all capitalized, as well as titles of sections (like CONTRIBUTORS). Should I all-cap "Symposium on Philip Ewell's SMT 2019 Plenary Paper, 'Music Theory's White Racial Frame'"? It seems like a bit much. Or just capitalize "Symposium" (SYMPOSIUM)? Or leave as is?

- Levi Walls

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mar 14, 2020, 9:22 PM

to Stephen, Benjamin, me

ps. I'm putting more space between Clark and Cook.

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 9:20 PM

To: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: [EXT] Re: Updated files put together into a single PDF and printing timeline

Levels addressed. In past volumes, names of authors have been all capitalized, as well as titles of sections (like CONTRIBUTORS). Should I all-cap "Symposium on Philip Ewell's SMT 2019 Plenary Paper, 'Music Theory's White Racial Frame'"? It seems like a bit much. Or just capitalize "Symposium" (SYMPOSIUM)? Or leave as is?

- Levi Walls

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 6:15 PM
To: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: [EXT] Re: Updated files put together into a single PDF and printing timeline

Alright. What do we think of this? I did it quickly, so I'll need to double check it, but as a sample, do we like it better? Again, I'm okay with either.

- Levi Walls

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 3:51 PM
To: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: [EXT] Re: Updated files put together into a single PDF and printing timeline

I'm doing it now so we can see what it looks like and compare. I'll send when I'm done.

- Levi Walls

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 3:44 PM
To: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Subject: Fw: [EXT] Re: Updated files put together into a single PDF and printing timeline
Forgot to reply all

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 3:43:50 PM
To: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: [EXT] Re: Updated files put together into a single PDF and printing timeline

Hi all,

I don't have a strong preference for one or the other solution. Luckily, it works

out so that it won't require a full reformatting of the page numbers. So, it will be a simple change. Shall I do it?

Regards,
Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 3:29:09 PM
To: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Cc: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Subject: [EXT] Re: Updated files put together into a single PDF and printing timeline

Dear Colleague,

I think that the *front* table of contents should list the authors and page numbers for the responses to Ewell. In other words, they should be treated like short articles, which is what most of them actually are.

Perhaps then, we can dispense with the list of contributors at the beginning of the section of responses as redundant.

Do you agree?

Best, Tim

On Sat, Mar 14, 2020 at 4:57 PM Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu> wrote:
Confirmed, thank you Levi!

BG

Benjamin Graf, Ph.D.

University of North Texas

Music History, Theory and Ethnomusicology

Office: MU215

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 4:55:05 PM
To: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Updated files put together into a single PDF and printing timeline

Hi all,

Using all the updated versions of articles, I've put everything together with accurate layout (so that new items begin on odd pages, as per house style) and page numbers (and pp. citations in Jackson and Boss have been updated). Please find this file attached.

In just a minute, I will send updated PDFs of separate articles to their respective authors, asking them to (once more) confirm that their contribution is to their specifications. Just to be sure.

Our current timeline looks like this: Dr. Graf is contacting authors with

contributor agreements and a request for a short (2–3 sentence) bio. Those will be coming in a few days. Karen says she will finish her own proofreading by the end of this coming week. If Karen has any corrections that need to be made, Dr. Graf and I will quickly make those changes. After that, we should be about ready to go. So, in conclusion, printing should occur around March 23rd. Dr. Graf, does this sound about right?

Thanks for your work, everyone!

Regards,
Levi Walls

[Final Article Confirmation, March 14, 2020]

schenker <schenker@unt.edu>

Sat, Mar 14, 5:33 PM

to me

Dear *JSS* contributor,

Attached is the "final" PDF setting of your article. This current version incorporates the page numbers and layout that will appear in the printed journal. Minor corrections may also have been made, as the journal has undergone the near-final stages of proofing. In order to be certain that the final product is to your specifications, please take the next several days to review the attached file for accuracy. You may take up until Wednesday (3/18) in order to have time for careful review.

In the next few days, our editor Ben Graf will contact you regarding the contributor agreement and request for a short (2–3 page) bio. So please be on the lookout for that email.

Thank you for your contribution to the *JSS*, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,
Levi Walls
Assistant Editor, *JSS*

[Correspondence between Ben Graf and Barry Wiener (one of the contra contributors to the JSS) on March 14 and 20, 2020]

On Mar 14, 2020, at 10:00 PM, schenker <schenker@unt.edu> wrote:

Dear *JSS* authors and advisory board,

As we put the finishing touches on volume 12 of our journal, I ask all contributors to reply (not reply all) with the following items within the next few business days:

- 1) Signed and dated contributor agreement form (see attached)
- 2) Current mailing address (for the distribution of your print copy)
- 3) Short bio for the "contributors" section (only 2–4 sentences please)

Levi Walls has done excellent work on this volume and the journal will be in good

hands as he takes over sole editorship of the JSS. In my view, the additional content that we collected this winter following Ewell's SMT plenary makes a great addition to an already remarkable publication. Later this week, Levi will take on some additional responsibilities, so I will be keeping track of these forms and publisher information. All three items should be fairly simple to return, so thank you in advance for your prompt attention to these items.

Cheers to getting this to press!

Sincerely,

Ben Graf

On 20 March, Ben Graf wrote to Wiener:

Thank you Barry! I should note that I enjoyed reading your response to Ewell. I am so glad you could contribute to this volume.

Best,

Ben

[Close to printing, May 2020]

Walls, Levi

Thu 5/21/2020 9:25 PM

To: Slottow, Stephen; Graf, Benjamin; Jackson, Timothy

Hi Dr. Slottow, and all,

As per house style and previous issues, new articles are to start on odd numbered pages, and if the previous article ends on an odd numbered page, the following even page is to be left blank. In regard to the Schachter article, Ben and I had discussed it and, after some consideration, weren't sure about singling out Schachter's article for republication because it would have been construed by some as a statement of a particular position on the part of the journal.

Congratulations on your promotion!

Regards,

Levi Walls

Slottow, Stephen

Wed 5/20/2020 11:10 PM

To: Walls, Levi; Graf, Benjamin; Jackson, Timothy

Levi (cc to Ben&Tim),

I was just now looking through the proofs for JSS 2019 and noticed numerous blank pages. Have these been removed? If not, why not?

Thanks,

-sps

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Apr 9, 2020, 11:12 PM

to Cary

Dear Prof. Nelson,
Here is the latest issue of the *Journal* with the responses to Ewell. Please let me know if you have any problem reading it.
With best wishes,
Tim

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Jul 3, 2020, 8:10PM

to Allen

Dear Allen,

Here is the latest issue with the complete symposium. This way, you can read all of the responses. I hope that this large file reaches you safely.

You absolutely MUST read Barry Wiener's response. He shows how Ewell's "Schenker quotations" misinterpret Schenker's true meaning.

This is not a matter of honest mistakes, but deliberate manipulation and decontextualization.

I look forward to your study of Rothgeb's counterpoint teaching very much. It will greatly enrich the Rothgeb issue. I will dig out the Laufer analysis instruction and send it to you. It is a bit in the same vein.

Best wishes,

Tim

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Jul 3, 2020, 8:13 PM

to Allen

PS. The printed version is out, but I have not yet received a copy due to problems associated with the pandemic.

By the way, *JSS* is open source, which means that back issues are all available on line. <https://digital.library.unt.edu/explore/collections/JSCS/>

[Levi Walls appointed as an assistant editor to help Ben as editor. Description of his duties.]

Brand, Benjamin

Thu 12/19/2019 3:31 PM

To: Slottow, Stephen; Jackson, Timothy

Cc: Graf, Benjamin

Schenkerian Studies- RA job description.docx

17 KB

Thanks again for putting this together. I've made some very light editorial changes (e.g. changing references to TA to RA). Ben, could you please forward this on to Levy if you haven't done so already?

Best,

Benjamin

Center for Schenkerian Studies — Research Assistant Position Description (12.12.2019)

The position of RA for the Center for Schenkerian Studies is divided into two areas of responsibility: the RA (1) will serve as editor of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies (UNT Press) and (2) will facilitate research activity for the Center for Schenkerian Studies.

I. Editor, Journal of Schenkerian Studies

- Solicit articles, reviews, and other special contributions for each issue of the journal. Distribute submissions to the appropriate reviewers, ideally members of the editorial board, and correspond to authors regarding the status of their respective submissions. For manuscripts that are accepted for publications, work with authors during the revising process and create the layout of each issue using the software InDesign. This includes the typesetting of both complex illustrations and graphical voice-leading analyses. Ultimately, all articles for publication must adhere to the Journal of Schenkerian Studies style sheet.

1

- After creating the final proof, the editor will work with the staff at UNT Press to complete the last revisions, cosmetic changes, placement of advertisements, acknowledgements, etc. so that the PDF document can be sent out for publication. The editor should remain in communication with the advisory board throughout this process.

- Following the release of print copies, the editor distributes copies to both the authors, editorial board members, and advisory board, while maintain a current record of mailing addresses and other pertinent contact information. The recipients are often international, which requires more consultation with the UNT Mailing services and the College of Music budget office.

- As an ongoing routine, the editor checks the Schenkerian Studies email account, responds to inquiries, and distributes promotional materials at conferences, events, etc.

II. Other duties to the Center

- The RA helps maintain and edit the Center's websites, including uploading and editing material on webpages.

- Other tasks encompass type-setting examples for Journal articles, both music and Schenkerian graphs.

Re. Levi Walls' Public Denunciation

Levi Walls began studying with me in 2016 and ended in July 2020 when he published a public denunciation on his Facebook page reproduced at the end of this document. The extensive email correspondence begins at that time, and continues up to attack. I have reduced many hundreds of emails to this compendium in order to provide a manageable document; every statement is backed up by a dated email either reproduced here or available upon demand.

As may be verified here, I often wrote Levi long emails containing serious discussions of music; there was a free exchange of ideas on female composers of lesser-known but with great value, such as Louise Ferranc, Zara Levina (email from 8/25/2018), Ruth Gibbs (from 9/23/2018), Dora Pejacevic (6/27/2018), Maria Teresa Prieto (from 12/14/2018), etc., our private analytical work together on French opera, such works by Bertin and Berlioz. From these exchanges of information, I never hesitated to send more information on topics of interest to him, always trying to broaden the scope of his knowledge. One can easily see that Levi respected my work and me personally as a great teacher over these four years. He asked me politely if I could be his major professor for his master's thesis (email on July 15, 2017): "...But on that topic! Even though I've been talking to you about my thesis, I don't want to make assumptions: I'd like to work on my thesis with you as my major professor. Would that be acceptable for you? If you have no room, I could also put you as my secondary and you could be my major professor when I do my dissertation." He wrote his masters thesis under me and he asked me to be his doctoral dissertation major professor.

Not only did I consistently provide him with informative materials concerning our mutual interests and my own analytical interpretations of wide range of works, I always complimented him on his progress and sent positive/constructive comments on his development - look at the email from Oct. 8, 2017 "These insights are truly profound! Bravo! You have the essence of a great, penetrating analysis here. So, go forward, and we can meet next Friday....," the email from Nov. 11, 2017 ... "I read through the proposal carefully and think that it is superb." An email from me to Levi on April 17, 2019 says "Thank-you for this (sending the link of his thesis). I am pleased that your writing has made great strides; actually, I am not surprised..." An email from me to Levi on June 9, 2020: "Bravo on the SMT acceptance! Great news indeed!"

Regarding my availability to meet with Levi, one can see I always did my best to meet his needs. For example, I was always willing to meet with him for extra lessons. I constantly was in touch with Levi to help his work during non-regular semesters, such as in May, 2018, and very intensive work including long emails discussing his work, extended over the summer of 2018, June 1-July 31!

Our work on various projects continued and there was always mutual respect and collegiality. I showed Levi every kindness that a professor could show a student. In May-July 2019, I offered to give him some of my LP collection, and stereo equipment I was not using. An email from Levi on June 1, 2019: "Again, thanks so much for the records! I already got a new bookcase for them

and all the operas are now organized. One more bookcase should do it. Oh no, not overwhelmed at all. I can't wait to dive into all the recordings/inserts." From Levi on July 3, 2019: "Thank you for offering more records, I'd be happy to accept. Thus far, one of my favorite recording has been Franck's D minor symphony, under Furtwängler's baton. I read parts of his biography with interest, especially regarding his opposition to the Nazis..."

I always offered full support for his Teaching Fellowship, travel fund, etc., look at the email on Mar. 10, 2017 - I always encouraged him, congratulated him on his achievements.

I wrote Levi a strong recommendation for his application for continuing his doctorate at UNT - see the email from Nov. 13, 2017. I came up with the strongest letter of recommendation (Nov. 30, 2017): "It is with pleasure that I write in the strongest support of Levi Walls's application for a place in the doctoral program in Music Theory at the University of North Texas. This is, in fact, a very easy recommendation to write since Levi is a truly excellent all-round student. He is currently writing his Masters thesis on the opera "L'Esmeralda" by Louise Bertin (based on a libretto by Victor Hugo) under my supervision. I can report that he has made tremendous progress this semester and is on his way to completing a first-class study of the structure of this opera and its connection with the plot (based on Hugo's famous novel, *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*). There is no doubt that Levi is currently one of our strongest Masters students, and I am fully confident that he will prosper in the doctoral program going forward. I have heard that he is an excellent student from all of the other professors with whom he has studied, without any exception, which does not surprise me in the least given what I know of him and his work. Levi enjoys my full and unqualified backing as he progresses with his studies."

The correspondence among Dr. Brand, the Division Chair, Levi, and myself, Feb. 19-20, 2020 shows that I strongly recommended Levi, marking his research "extremely important" for him to receive support from a travel fund for doctoral students so that he could deliver a paper in Newcastle.

Not only did we discuss work-related matters, but we have been on friendly terms, exchanging personal news and family regards.

After our emergency meeting on July 26, 2020, regarding the vicious attack on the Journal on Twitter and other social media, Levi's attitude suddenly completely changed. Please look at the very last part [Self-Criticism by Levi Walls posted on FB, July 27, 2020: Total Transformation].

1. Levi defames my character by claiming he "feared" retaliation from me if he would have given up the job as Schenker TA. There is NO evidence in the correspondence for 4 years showing any kind of abuse of power on my part such that Levi simply had to do whatever I "ordered" him to do. Both verbal and written communications between us were based on mutual collegiality as documented here. I was always proud of his work and came forward with my strongest support on various occasions as described above because I truly believed in his potential capability to develop into a prominent young scholar.

2. In his self-criticism, Levi portrays me as a dictator who made all the important decisions by myself, but that is incorrect, as is documented by letters among 5 active advisory board members as well as 2 additional theory faculty members at UNT. Please read the email from Levi on Nov. 15-19, 2019. He came forward to me *first* with his own opinion and ideas about Prof. Ewell's talk, and he was very critical - especially Levi's email on Nov. 17, 2019 presents a long list of problems concerning Ewell's presentation. After our discussions on emails, I came up with the idea of publishing responses to Ewell's talk in the Journal. When I shared my proposal with Levi, he thought it was very appropriate to do so (Levi's email to me on Nov. 19, 2019) and took the initiative to discuss it with other board members voluntarily without me requesting it at all. His claim that he didn't have any power to do anything on his own is contradicted by the documents!

3. Levi "confesses" in this FB post that he essentially agreed with Ewell and was "dumbfounded" by my disgusting and harmful rhetoric after reading my response. In fact, Levi was unconstrained to criticize the conclusion of my article and urge that I made changes (March 12), and I heeded his and others' advice: "Hi all, Here is the new version of Dr. Jackson's response. Instances of "classical" are uncapitalized, page numbers for Slottow and Wiener are put in. And all the other changes were incorporated as well. Dr. Slottow may have a point about the Kafka reference. I can see some of our ethnomusicologist colleagues taking it the wrong way. It's up to you, of course, but it may be better to frame that last point in a more positive way. Perhaps, instead of placing a value judgement on ethnomusicology, you might consider framing the issue in terms of there being a good reason that theory, musicology, and ethnomusicology are different fields, because ethnomusicology, you might consider framing the issue in terms of there being a good reason that theory, musicology, and ethnomusicology are different fields, because they have different aims. In other words, the three branches are separate but equal (for lack of a phrase without such baggage), and equilibrium will only result in a less diverse range of perspectives. But, again, you could go either way.
Regards,
Levi Walls"

If Levi felt negatively at the beginning of March, why did he keep writing to me both personal and professional emails asking for me to become his dissertation advisor? He certainly didn't have to choose me as his dissertation advisor and it frequently happens that the students change their major professors for the dissertation, not to mention that I have no possibility to harm those students who wish to avoid me. Even on his email from July 25, 2020, he clearly goes against Ewell's and his followers' accusation toward the JSS for being unethical and unprofessional because Ewell was not invited to participate in the same issue, since he wrote: "...I'm also confused about what exactly people want. The responses were to Ewell's paper. Did Ewell want to respond to his own paper? If he wants to respond to the responses to his paper, then that is perfectly reasonable, and I don't think anyone would have a problem with that. We could publish something in the upcoming volume, if that is what people want. But he couldn't have responded to responses that hadn't yet come out..." If he went through so much inner suffering between March and July as he confessed in his FB post, how can he have acted this way?

4. On Dec. 2, 2019, in an email, Levi and Ben Graf both agreed to go forward with publishing responses in the JSS vol. 12, not delaying further. This is documented by Ben's email on Dec. 2 ("We should go forward with the call and be open to publishing more on this matter in future publications.")

5. Levi is a doctoral student who worries about developing his career and just had a baby. I understand his burdens and pressures fully; however, his public defamation of his professor is not the path that a scholar with integrity and personal honor would take. I am profoundly saddened by his false accusations widely publicized on Facebook – accusations by a student of whom I thought very highly. I cannot accept this public defamation of my character as a scholar and a human being, and that is why I feel compelled to share the documentary record, which paints a totally different picture of our student-teacher relationship as it actually existed.

Therefore, documentation of my collegial teacher-student relationship with Levi Walls extending back into 2016 is presented below.

Until Levi Walls' public Facebook denunciation of me I never heard him express any concerns whatsoever about his work with me as his mentor.

In his plenary lecture, Ewell included Allen Forte of Yale alongside Ernst Oster as one who had "whitewashed" Schenker in his slide. According to Ewell, Forte and Oster had colluded to conceal Schenker's "virulent racism." Now, Forte had been Ewell's dissertation advisor at Yale. I know from Madeleine Forte, Allen's widow, that Allen had shown Ewell every kindness and consideration. Even if Ewell's accusation had been true rather than being false, I think that he should never have made it public. I say this because I believe that there is - and should be - *a sacred bond* between teacher and student that is not dissimilar to that between father and son or father and daughter. This is why the Germans refer to a doctoral dissertation advisor as "Doktorvater" or doctoral "father." When I look at the behavior of some of my former students, I have to wonder about their personal code of honor, integrity, and honesty. Does self-preservation justify lying and misrepresentation? Does a student have the right to publicly shame his former teacher, especially one who showed him every kindness, and who went well beyond the call of duty to give him every possible material help and educational advice?

This question of personal integrity continues to haunt me.

The Idea for the Symposium Evolved from Discussions with Walls, Other Graduate Students and Schenkerians around the World

Levi asked to discuss Ewell's Plenary Speech with me. The idea that I forced any of my ideas on him – or any other student - is totally false. One can see from this correspondence that he had a clear picture of *shared concerns* about Ewell's presentation from the very beginning. At no time did I censor Levi's views, nor did I doubt that he was sincere in holding his own views.

Meeting

Inbox

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Fri, Nov 15, 2019, 10:18 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Hope you are well! When would you like to get together to talk about Bach? Unfortunately, I haven't had any time to devote to Berlioz lately, as I've been swamped with classes and private teaching. But I would be happy to discuss the Passion in more detail. Of course, you've dedicated considerably more time to it than I have but I can surely follow you and share any thoughts/questions! At the moment, I can't leave Denton Thursday-Sunday because my wife takes the car to work all day. But I can travel monday- wednesday, or meet on campus any day.

Regards,

Levi

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Fri, Nov 15, 2019, 10:40 AM

to me

I would also be very interested in discussing a particular Schenker paper from SMT. You've likely heard about it, as it caused quite a stir. I was very ambivalent about it because it suggested that analysis that utilizes levels of hierarchy is inherently racist, which strikes me as naive. Reinhold Brinkmann made a very similar claim about Lorenz, saying that his desire to have every part of a piece serve some structural whole was totalitarian (and obviously linking that idea to his political beliefs).

- Levi Walls

From: Walls, Levi

Sent: Friday, November 15, 2019 8:18 AM

To: Timothy Jackson <schermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Ewell

Inbo
x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Mon, Nov 18,
2019, 8:08 AM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

This is not a reply to your points, which I need to consider, but my own rumination:

Is Ewell making the absurd claim that Schenkerian voice leading analysis is inherently racist, and is his attitude to Schenker and Schenkerians anti-Semitic explicitly or implicitly? (I am reminded of fake news and the world-is-flat people!) Is Ewell a poseur?

I have been thinking that all demagogues have this in common: they use widespread legitimate grievances - here generalized racism in the US and the challenges it poses to academics of color - to lash out against perceived targets of opportunity. That is what Hitler did with the Jews, and what Trump does today with non-White immigrants and others: in this case, does Ewell seize upon Schenker and Schenkerians - mostly Jews, and mostly immigrants fleeing the Nazis - and blame them for the paucity of Blacks in the field of music theory? I have been thinking that Allen Forte, who gave Ewell - and, for that matter female and Jewish students, a chance - would be turning in his grave if he knew what Ewell is now saying, if that is indeed the case.

On another somewhat more genial topic, I send the score examples for a talk that I gave back in 2000 about Bach's Saint John Passion, and more specifically, about the role of the recapitulation in the aria No. 35, the soprano aria, "Zerfliesse, mein Herz." Usually, Bach employs the da capo aria form, with its clearly defined A and B sections, whereby the A section is repeated after the B. But here in this special aria - exceptionally - Bach limits himself to to just A and B sections. That being said, still, even without the literal repetition of the entire A section, he finds a way to preserve the da capo form. I believe that, quite remarkably, he achieves this by working repetitions of parts of the A section in the B section! In my annotated score, I indicate precisely those places in the latter part of the aria where elements of the A section reappear. Of course, from a tonal-structural perspective, these musical elements are now revalued, and their transformation represents the changes brought about in the worshipper's soul by experiencing Christ's sacrifice first-hand, i.e., by reliving the Passion with Christ. *That* is the underlying motivation for Bach's unusual treatment of the da capo form in this aria.

Best wishes, Tim
Attachments area

Tim
oth
y
Jac
kso
n

Mon, Nov 18, 2019,
8:12 AM

Dear Students, If we can find the time to discuss it, I send the score examples for a talk that I gave back in 2000 about Bach's Saint John Passion, and more sp

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mon, Nov 18,
2019, 9:41 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Thank you, we're very excited about the baby. The due date is March 17, so still a little ways to go.

Yes, the paper's willful ignorance of Schenker's Jewish identity is indeed troubling. That seems to mark it as implicitly antisemitic, at the very least. I think that, had he limited his criticisms to Schenker the man, it would have been slightly less problematic. But his claim that the entire theoretical world view—and by extension those who helped spread it—is racist becomes very problematic when we consider the intimate connection between schenkerian analysis and the Jewish identity. I think that it is possible to address biases in Schenker studies (and academia in general) and advocate for increased transparency without demonizing an entire methodology (especially one with strong Jewish roots). Ewell's talk certainly failed in that regard.

Regards,

Levi

Response to Ewell

Inbo
x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Nov 19,
2019, 1:33 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

It occurred to me that it might be appropriate for the *Journal* to solicit responses to Ewell from a number prominent Schenkerians - if they would be willing to reply - and publish a small collection. What do you think of this idea?

In my view, some of Ewell's comments about Schenker are an example of intellectual dishonesty. I believe that this contention should be - politely - proven, and a "Response" to be justified and appropriate.

The racist passages from Schenker's letters and diary Ewell cited from "Schenker documents on line" were unknown to those scholars he critiques for sanitizing Schenker's published writings. To the point, these comments from SDO were not known by Forte, Rothstein, Rothgeb, and others because they were *inaccessible*, buried in the letters and diary. So, Ewell's critique of these scholars is unfair. But Ewell goes further and pretends that *racist* comments were excised by them from Schenker's publications, while the passages moved into appendices were not racist in content like these items cited from SDO. It is a cheap shot.

In fact, Schenker's strongest vituperation was *never* toward Blacks, but the French, who are and were, especially at that time, mostly White!, and primarily during and after WW I. There are sustained passages in Schenker's diary against the "White" French that prefigure Nazi anti-Semitic propaganda in their virulence.

Schenker's Eurocentrism - perhaps better, German-centrism - was by no means exceptional; it was also common at that time in European culture. It was based on many factors, Kant and German philosophy being one of them.

I read most of Schenker's 5600-page diary in the original before it was on SDO, and the comments Ewell cites about Blacks in particular are extremely rare and marginal at best. That does not excuse them; however, these views were so universal in the early 20th century, and by no means exceptional, that I would have been surprised if Schenker did *not* think in that way. What WAS noteworthy in Schenker was his extreme

"Volkisch" German Nationalism, and especially his sustained demonization of the French. So, if Schenker was the virulent anti-people-of-color that Ewell makes him out to be, why then did he pick so much on the (White) French, reserving for them his most hateful spleen? His comment about Black French soldiers is taken out of context; it is part-and-parcel of his tirade against everything French, and mostly *White* French.

Part - but not all - of the "dark" side of Schenker's personality was well known to his students and colleagues. Again, the diary and letters on SDO were still sleeping in the archives. However, I think that Schachter told me, for example, that Jonas studied for one year with Schenker when he was 19, but then left him for Weisse because he just could not stand Schenker's extremism.

A topic that comes up in different contexts in Schenker's diary is racism in the context of his and his wife's Jewishness - something that Ewell ignores - and the problem of anti-Semitism. As a Jew himself and as the target of racism, Schenker was keenly aware of both anti-Semitism and racism, and he became increasingly so as the Nazis assumed power in neighboring Germany; yet as the outside commentators on Ewell pointed out, he failed to mention even once Schenker's Jewishness, and that of most of his students, and what this meant, and this lacuna is self-serving. As Schachter pointed out years ago in a talk about Schenker that he gave in Tallinn, Schenker was not a fan of Hitler. This fact reveals that Schenker's views changed and evolved over time, and, especially in response to the rise of Nazism and anti-Semitism in Germany - and also Austria - in the late 1920s and early 1930s Schenker began to sober up.

Ewell's thesis that the practice of Schenkerian analysis cannot be divorced from Schenker's political theory means that the approach must be inherently anti-French, although Ewell fails to point this out, and none of the Schenkerians seem to have noticed it. Or, perhaps, following upon Ewell's conspiracy theory, they do know but are hiding it. Does this undercut our work on Berlioz, Mehul, and other French composers?

At some point I will send more the annotated score of the Saint John Passion.

With best wishes, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

**Tue, Nov 19,
2019, 3:16 PM**

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

I agree that a response in the JSS would be very appropriate. It would be nice to have it for the upcoming issue, although it is very forthcoming (around mid-December).

A response in issue 13 would of course be quite late. Did you have any particular schenkerians in mind? Dr. Graf and I can discuss some candidates tomorrow at our weekly meeting and get requests out as early as tomorrow evening. Perhaps we should also set a page limit for each respondent, though we have room in the upcoming issue, so I don't think there's any need to be particularly restrictive.

Regards,

Levi Walls

Documentation (2016-2020)

Levi was interested in French music, so that I worked on the composer Alkan with him outside of any formal class setting to help him improve his analytical skills.

levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>

Thu, Dec 22,
2016, 10:56 AM

to me

Dr. Jackson,

I wanted to check in just to share what I'm working on this break. As I mentioned in your office, I'm studying the philosophies of Hegel. I also have some books I checked out about Schopenhauer and Kant that I'm studying. Other than analyzing the Schumann quartet in A minor (I'm also performing a four-hand transcription of it with a friend when I visit California in January) I'm trying to become more familiar with religious and mythological texts. I'm an atheist, but I'm interested from an academic standpoint and because it's obviously an important part of music history. I've found it difficult in the past to find scholarly unbiased interpretations of religious history but I've been watching a series of Yale lectures on YouTube that are very good. Right now, I'm in the middle of a videotaped course on the New Testament. That's usually what I study when my eyes get tired from reading, which happens quickly right now because I have the flu. I can tell it's almost better though. If you have any materials you'd like to suggest in the religion and mythology department I'll take a look. Otherwise, I'll continue my own course of

study. Thanks!

, Levi Walls

Sent from my iPhone

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, Dec 23,
2016, 11:24 PM

to levi

Dear Levi,

It is good to hear from you, and about your readings in philosophy and history.

Perhaps you might find interesting some work that I have been doing on the way - I believe - Chopin and Alkan recomposed a compositional idea that they may have taken from another pianist-composer by the name of Masarnau. I will forward you some of the material and you can see what you think.

With best wishes, Tim

Re: Audition

Inbo
x

levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>

Sun, Mar 19,
2017, 12:10 PM

to me

Hi Dr. Jackson,

Can I schedule an office appointment with you this Friday at 11am to talk about Alkan? Thanks!

, Levi Walls

On Fri, 3/10/17, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: Re: Audition
To: "levi walls" <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>
Date: Friday, March 10, 2017, 3:03 PM

Bravo on the Fellowship! That is important.
Yes, do work on the Alkan and then we can compare readings and discuss!

Bravo again. I am happy about that.
Tim

On Fri, Mar 10, 2017 at
11:54 AM, levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>
wrote:

Sorry, I didn't give you much notice for that. I think I'll use my noon hour to eat before class though. Over the break, I'll try to cobble my Alkan stuff into a coherent analysis that actually says something meaningful about the piece, rather than just analysis for analysis sake. I also wanted to mention that I got a theory fellowship, so that's exciting!

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 10, 2017, at 9:56 AM, levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>
wrote:

Dr. Jackson,

No worries, I know you're busy. I can drop by at 11:15, if that works. Noon is also okay. Let me know if either of those times work.

, Levi Walls

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 9, 2017, at 5:08 PM, Timothy Jackson
<shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
wrote:

Dear Levi,

I am sorry that I have not gotten back to you about your analysis of the B section of the Alkan. Perhaps it would be good to meet and discuss it in person. I am in MWF and teach from 10-11. We could meet before or after my class.

Your comment about "bells" is apt indeed. It also brings to mind Rachmaninov, who was fascinated by bells, and who incorporated references to them into multiple works, and not just "The Bells." The question I would ask is, how does the "bell" interpretation relate

the middle section to the surrounding music, not just syntactically but semantically: why does Alkan want to reference bells?

I have a slightly different interpretation, namely that the ostinato is a reference to a clock (rather than to bells per se), and thus to "the measuring of the passing of time." However it might be both to a clock and bells - rather than "either or" "both and" - since clock towers often mark the passing of time by ringing their bells on the hour, half-hour, and quarter-hour. Again, the question would be, if "the passing of time" is the central metaphor in the middle section, then how would this semantic interact with and relate to the surrounding music? Perhaps a clue to "the time passing" interpretation linking the middle section with the A and A' parts might be the whole problem of the opening, where we begin "in medias res," as already discussed. If this is an accurate interpretation, then we would have to assume a pre-existing time-space in which music starts and is playing before it becomes audible. According to this reasoning, the middle section and the transition from the middle section to the reprise of the opening might give us some clues as to the prehistory of the piece. This issue, then, might be the semantic link between the outer parts and the middle section.....

Best,
Tim

On Sun,
Mar 5, 2017 at 7:29 PM, levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>
wrote:
Dr.
Jackson,

I've been working on the Trio section. This is my graph for the first 80 measures or so (when it returns to Ab). I numbered the measures starting at the Trio rather than original measure numbers. It's especially clear from this section that Alkan was also an organ player; both the alternating Eb and Bb throughout, and the bass octaves at mm. 8, 40, and 78, are meant to function as pedals. In the case of the ever present Eb to Bb, it contributes to the bell-like sonority of the passage. French composers of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries were interested in bells, which had a social significance in French rural life (I recently checked out a book titled "Village Bells: Sound and Meaning in the 19th-century French Countryside" by Alain Corbin but haven't had time to read it yet). The bass octaves have more of a structural importance and, in each case, correspond to the prolonged harmony shown in my graphs. My graphs don't account for every pitch and may skip steps in their simplification of the material, but I believe the end result is accurate: measures 9-40 and 77-94 both prolong tonic harmony and utilize a 4+4+8 sentence structure (77-78 is a lead-in). Measures 41-76, meanwhile, prolong dominant harmony.

, Levi Walls

Levi applied for a Teaching Fellowship, and I supported him.

On Feb 21,

2017, at 12:47 PM, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

wrote:

Well, let's really hope

for the best as far as the TF position is concerned. You will improve, and hopefully, if you must reapply next year, then you will be better prepared. I think that it would be good to continue the kind of analysis that you were doing on the Alkan. The more in-depth analysis you do, the greater the facility that you have with analyzing harmony – and potentially explaining it as well.

When you have time, you should continue the Alkan, and I will be happy to discuss it further with you.

Tim

On Tue, Feb 21, 2017 at

9:28 AM, levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com> wrote:

Haha. Not sure. I controlled my nerves pretty well. But then I inexplicably forgot what key I was in. It was an odd mistake, and normally I don't have trouble with something so simple.

But mistakes, regardless of circumstances, show that I'm not comfortable talking through an analysis in real time. I need to get faster and have it be natural. I got a collection of Bach chorales since the interview and I just practice playing through them and saying the analysis out loud, limiting the time I have to identify each chord to a few seconds. One more thing to improve on.

Sent from my

iPhone

On Feb 20, 2017, at 10:27 PM, Timothy Jackson

<shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

wrote:

Dear Levi,

Thanks for the report. What was the issue with the analysis, if I may ask?

Best, Tim

On Mon, Feb 20, 2017 at

8:46 AM, levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>

wrote:

Hey Dr.

Jackson,

I have to wait two weeks before I hear about my audition. It went alright. I had no trouble with aural skills and sight singing went alright. I read the Bach chorale without difficulties, but I confused myself while talking about the analysis (which should have been the easy part of the audition) and had to recover from that. It was alright overall. I might get an assistantship. We'll see. I'll let you know though, since you asked!

Thanks!

, Levi Walls

Giving Levi extra help with analyzing pieces outside of class:

levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>

Fri, Mar 24,
2017, 12:42 PM

to me

Hey Dr. Jackson,

We had a meeting at noon, but something must have come up. No worries, though. I appreciate all your help! I dropped some graphs under your door, some new, some redone. I'm still pretty slow at it, but I'm doing a lot of analysis this summer as I explore thesis topics and I'm taking the schenker class next semester, so I'll get plenty of graphing practice soon.

Best, Levi Walls

Levi expressed interest in female composers of Classical music, so that I suggested some worthy of study:

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sun, May 14,
2017, 11:08 PM

to Levi

PPS. If you are interested in a great work by a female composer of the 19th century, try out the *last* movement of Louise Farrenc's Third Symphony in G minor. I think that Farrenc, when she is inspired, as in this Finale, could be greatest female composer of the 19th century. Personally, I have the impression that Fanny Mendelssohn and Clara Schumann are somewhat mediocre composers, with Fanny a good notch above Clara. But Farrenc, by contrast, does have the spark of real "genius" for lack of a better word. I would be interested if you agree.

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mon, May 15,
2017, 5:12 PM

to me

Thank you, this all looks very promising! I'll be in touch soon on my studies!

Sent from my iPhone

Levi shared his idea for his masters thesis, which he wrote under my direction:

Thesis idea

Inbo

levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>

Thu, Jun 8,
2017, 2:12 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

I would appreciate your opinion on a research topic I've been thinking about. It concerns an opera (La Esmeralda) by Louise Bertin (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louise_Bertin) that is based on Hugo's Notre-Dame de Paris. The libretto was written by Hugo himself, who Bertin was friends with. She was also friends with Berlioz, who assisted in staging the opera. The work (as well as Bertin's opera career) was ill-fated, however. Accusations were made concerning the extent of Berlioz's assistance and it became public opinion that the better parts of the opera were actually written by him. This resulted in the opera's run being cut short. It is clear from letters from Berlioz to his sister that the accusations had no truth to them (assuming he had no reason to lie in a personal correspondence to this sister), however I'd like to approach the issue theoretically. The paper would analyze parts of La Esmeralda and compare it to Berlioz's operatic works, and defend the authorship of Bertin's work by showing the differences in style (text-setting, orchestration, formal/harmonic structure, etc.). It would spotlight the work of a lesser-known composer, while also looking at the output of a well-known composer through a different lens. Practical reasons for this project include its originality, the fact that authorship-defense papers are interesting and exhibit both persuasive and analytical skill, the score and recording are both easily accessible (I have both), and I can read French at an adequate level, so I'd have access to those resources as well without too much trouble. In preparation, I would read as many articles/books about Berlioz as possible in order to become very familiar with his style of composition.

I read The Sexuality of Christ in Renaissance Art and Modern Oblivion. It was super interesting. I need to think more actively about visual art. I tend to just take it in passively, so the issues addressed in the book were things I'd never even thought about. I also bought a copy of Lives of the Artists, but I haven't gotten to it yet.

Hope you're enjoying your break!

, Levi Walls

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Jun 8,
2017, 8:26 PM

to levi

Dear Levi,

I think that you have here a potentially great topic! But let me qualify and define my enthusiasm as follows.

The whole story of Bertin's opera failing because it was believed that Berlioz had written parts of it strikes me as bizarre, and could even be historically incorrect. Re. authorship, like you, I am inclined to take Berlioz at his word!

If Bertin's opera failed, I suspect that the cause or causes had little to do with the improbable myth of Berlioz's authorship or contribution, but with other factors, which *might* include certain perceived weaknesses in the opera itself, and prejudice against a female composer. But with regard to prejudice against female composers in 19th-century France, it is noteworthy that Louise Farrenc (whose music I admire greatly) enjoyed considerable, real critical success in France, even though she was a woman. This fact suggests that prejudice against female composers, while it certainly existed, was insufficient in itself to *guarantee* failure for Bertin's opera, and it is most probably other factors intrinsic to the opera itself that were the cause. But this whole issue of the reasons for its failure seems something of a red herring anyway, since even if the work did not achieve popularity in its own time that does not mean that it is *necessarily* bad or weak but rather that it did not correspond to contemporary taste in a way to achieve success. Remember that the first version of Puccini's *Madame Butterfly* "failed" in its first performances, and then, with modifications by the composer, went on to become the most performed opera ever! This kind of delayed recognition and popularity can be observed in the reception history of not a few operas! So, what really matters is that *La Esmeralda* is of lasting value and importance - and the fact that it has enjoyed a revival in 2008 suggests that it IS an important work with its own internal integrity. The collaboration of Bertin with such figures as V. Hugo and Berlioz suggests that they believed this opera project to be important!!!!

In my experience, Berlioz's music is very idiosyncratic, and he also has different styles in different pieces, and even parts of them. I think that it would be a really very difficult and huge task to pin down all of Berlioz's stylistic languages, and then "prove" by means of such analysis that he could NOT have contributed to Bertin's opera. Furthermore, is such an effort really necessary, especially when we have his assurance to his sister that he did not write it? As you quite rightly point out, why would he lie to her?

Rather, what I think would be much more interesting, achievable, and (in my view) very valuable would be for you to focus on an in-depth analysis of Bertin's *La Esmeralda* as it stands, both the music and the libretto. *That I think would be a truly marvelous project!*

Of course, you could contextualize La Esmeralda by comparing it to other French operas of its time and slightly before to see how it conforms or deviates from potential models. But I still think that keeping the focus on the opera itself, analyzing its music, plot, and libretto in depth, would provide more than enough great material for a thesis!

I notice that a manuscript score of Act III is available on line. Is there a modern edition of the entire opera, both vocal and full scores? And is there just the CD of the 2008 performance, or also a video? Have you studied the music and begun to analyze it? I have just started listening to the opera to get a sense of it and it is not simple: to do the analysis well and do justice to the music will be sufficiently challenging for a thesis!

By the way, did I send you the finale of Farrenc's Third Symphony? I think that the conclusion of this symphony is truly remarkable.

Best wishes, Tim

levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>

Fri, Jun 9,
2017, 2:59 PM

to me

Dr. Jackson,

Yeah, I was a bit worried about that possibility; if it was going to do well, it probably wouldn't have been hindered so easily. But I agree that its support from figures like Hugo and Berlioz, as well as its recent revival, is a testament to its probable value.

I have a 2009 edition of the vocal score from 1837. It was apparently put together by Liszt, so add another figure who cared about the project. That being said, I believe the Bertin family had quite a bit of money, so I'll have to look into exactly how invested these figures were on the merits of the project alone. Anyway, I don't believe a full score was ever published. I think I found the same manuscript of the third act as you on gallica.bnf.fr. On the same site, I've found all the acts with choices to download or buy reproductions. I successfully downloaded the second act, but the others keep failing. I think it's just my internet though. The others will probably work if I keep trying.

I've just barely begun to analyze. But I like this for my thesis and can see there's plenty there to write about. I'll spend more time on it. I agree with you now on the focus being more general and not splitting the focus between Bertin and Berlioz unnecessarily. After all, the alleged controversy was already denied by Berlioz himself. I can still compare them, but more within the context of French opera of the time. Maybe I can even find a significant reason that it fell short with contemporary audiences. But

maybe not. At any rate, this work should serve as a good test of my analytical skills. Must get cracking on it immediately!

Yes, you sent me Farrenc. I'd heard her before from unsungmasterworks. The low strings at the last bit before the coda of the last movement remind me of Paganini. A superficial observation, but there it is.

Thanks for your valuable input! I gotta hit this one out of the park!

, Levi Walls

Sent from my iPhone

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, Jun 9,
2017, 5:29 PM

to levi

Dear Levi,

Just listening to the music on Youtube without the score, I can hear that Bertin's musical language is definitely allied to that of Liszt and Berlioz (and the so-called New German School, although she is French), but perhaps even closer to *Liszt* than Berlioz, which is why Liszt would have considered the opera important enough for *him* to prepare the vocal score. Farrenc's musical language, by contrast, in my view, falls more into the so-called "Classical" tradition. So these two streams co-existed side-by-side in France.

I have studied Liszt's oratorio *Saint Elisabeth*, and Bertin's *La Esmeralda* reminds me of certain techniques employed by Liszt. Analyzing this music will definitely pose challenges.

Could you please send me the score of the second act....? And also the links to the other acts, and I can see if I can get them.

Bertin herself could not really be part of the initial production because she was an invalid; the fact that she could not participate may have contributed very significantly to the opera's contemporary failure since composers were usually intimately involved with every detail of the premieres of their operas, and played a crucial role in achieving success.

All of this suggests that Bertin was a person with enormous strength of character to achieve as much as she did given the challenges she faced! My guess is that the subject of the opera appealed to her for personal reasons.....

I find the music that I have heard most interesting and compelling. Indeed, the enthusiastic reception accorded it by the modern audience suggests that the opera is much, much better than its reception history would lead one to believe!

With best wishes, Tim



ReplyForward

Louise Bertin and opera in Paris in the 1820s and 1830s

Inbo
x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 12,
2017, 7:31 AM

to levi

Dear Levi,

You MUST read this dissertation on Proquest Dissertations on Line:

Louise Bertin and opera in Paris in the 1820s and 1830s

[BONEAU, DENISE LYNN](#). The University of Chicago, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 1989. T-31006.

<http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2065/pqdtglobal/docview/252273506/57DBFAD855804DB4PQ/1?accountid=7113>

There is a huge amount of historical information relevant to your topic.

Best, Tim

In order to help Levi develop his thesis topic, I sent him some of my own unpublished work on Debussy's opera *Pelleas*:

On Sat, Jun 10, 2017 at 9:39 PM, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Levi,

Analyzing opera poses some special challenges, although the basics remain the same. I just sent you some of my analytical work on Pelleas to give you an idea as to how you might go about it. You need to map out the large-scale tonal structure for La Esmeralda.

It would be helpful to have clearer scans of the vocal score for La Esmeralda, so I look forward to receiving them!

I have analyzed Wagner's Tristan and Parsifal, Strauss's Salome, Elektra, and Die Frau ohne Schatten, Berg's Wozzeck, and Puccini's Butterfly, Tosca, Suor Angelika, and Turandot in a similar way to Pelleas, and in every case there is a coherent tonal structure governing every level of the opera. I have no doubt that there is such an organizational structure behind La Esmeralda as well.

I can send you my work on some of these other operas at a later point, but I think that you have enough right now with Pelleas, and also, of course, La Esmeraldo!

Best wishes, Tim

On Sat, Jun 10, 2017 at 8:09 PM, levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com> wrote:
Dr. Jackson,

Oh yes. I took those scans just then with my phone for you. I need to make a trip to a real scanner soon. I'll also send you those since they'll be better in quality. I have snippets of a Pelleas et Melisande analysis from you. It's mostly act V excerpts in connection with Madama Butterfly. If there's more, I'd appreciate having it. Thanks!

, Levi Walls

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 10, 2017, at 7:33 PM, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Levi,

I got it now. Before you return the vocal score, you may wish to check your scan and rescan certain pages, which are blurred.

It really is a great work! Amazing! As I wrote you, the contemporary failure may have been due to poor performance, partly the result of lack of supervision by the composer herself.

By the way, the 2008 performance on Youtube makes cuts. I can understand that they wanted to tighten it, especially since modern audiences will have trouble sitting through such a long work as it is....

Did I share with you my analysis of Debussy's *Pelleas et Melisande*? It might be helpful to look at it given the challenges posed in analyzing opera.

Best, Tim

levi walls <chopinlevi@yahoo.com>

Tue, Jun 13,
2017, 10:39 AM

to me

This is a great paper. I don't know how much you read, but the author had some serious access to Bertin's history through primary sources. She went to France on a Fulbright and actually connected with Bertin's descendants. The information about her relationship with Hugo is very interesting; Boneau suggests that, because he wrote the libretto almost concurrently with the novel, he had Bertin in mind as an inspiration from the get-go (pg. 39). I have to be skeptical of statements like that, because (as incredible as that would be) it seems unlikely considering what she says in chapter 6. Apparently, Hugo had aspirations of working on an opera early on and intended to have Notre-Dame set. But it seems like he settled on Bertin. That's not to say that he doubted her ability; he obviously held her in enormous regard (pgs. 32-33). But Hugo had reservations about working with composers of too grand a stature, explaining why he rejected Rossini and Meyerbeer, both of whom were interested in the project (pg. 403-405). Ultimately, he decided between Berlioz and Bertin, with whom he felt he could maintain artistic control (pg. 407). The relationship between Bertin and Hugo's wife was a bit strained. There's no evidence of romantic entanglement between Hugo and Bertin, but his wife really didn't like her. She felt that he wasted his only operatic venture on her and even went as far as to say that the project cursed everything even vaguely connected with it (citing the crashing of a ship called "Esmeralda").

Anyway, I'm still reading it, but it's clearly going to be invaluable! I should also read Hugo's novel. I've never read it before.

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Jun 13,
2017, 11:36 AM

to levi

Dear Levi,

Yes, I skimmed all of this, not having time to read the whole dissertation carefully. And, yes, it IS very important for your project.

Years ago, when I was 17, and on my first trip by myself to France, I visited Victor Hugo's house in Paris, which is also a museum. I recall being very struck by Hugo's drawings on exhibit there.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maison_de_Victor_Hugo

https://www.google.com/search?q=victor+hugo+drawings&rlz=1C1CHZL_enUS732US732&tbm=isch&tbo=u&source=univ&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwil39DsnbvUAhVI2SYKHR0eBaMQsAQIJw&biw=2560&bih=1335&dpr=1.5

Hugo's drawings are amazing, and closely related to the "gothic" quality of his writing. I don't know if he made drawings for the "Hunchback" - this is something that you must research. But there are clearly drawings related to the issues treated in both the novel and the opera!

The "Hunchback" is a great novel, which I read as a teenager in English translation.

The fact that Hugo selected Bertin, whether he wanted to "control" her artistically or not, is very significant from various points of view. By the way, just because Bertin was physically rather ugly and misshapen - like the Hunchback himself - does not mean that Madame Hugo would not be jealous of her husband having a close intellectual-artistic relationship with Bertin! I can understand Madame Hugo feelings on this point!

You might want to have a crack at reading the novel simultaneously in BOTH the original French and English translation to get a sense of Hugo's language.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sat, Jul 15,
2017, 12:02 AM

to me

Dr. Jackson,

You're welcome! I appreciate your time. My work on Bertin isn't progressing very fast at the moment. It's definitely what I want to write my thesis on, but I want to spend some more time reading literature before school starts back up and I'm sleeping and breathing Bertin. Right now, I'm going through Austen and the Brontë sisters' novels, plus a stack of Oxford "Short Introduction To" books my wife got me for our anniversary. I still want to get a good head-start on analyzing Bertin before the semester starts, so I'll get back to you on it soon.

But on that topic! Even though I've been talking to you about my thesis, I don't want to make assumptions: I'd like to work on my thesis with you as my major professor. Would that be acceptable for you? If you have no room, I could also put you as my secondary and you could be my major professor when I do my dissertation.

, Levi Walls

In July 2017, Levi decided to write his thesis on French opera composer Louise Bertin under me:

Sat, Jul 15,
2017, 7:57 AM

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Naturally I would like to work on the Bertin with you as your major professor! It is tremendously fascinating to me too for all the reasons we have discussed.

Recently, I have been discussing with my close friend Madeleine Forte a recent book (in French) about music in Paris during the Nazi occupation. Madeleine is, of course, French and a kind of still living connection with pre-WW 2 French culture (she is now almost 80). She KNEW many of the people involved!!!! She herself was an amazing pianist who studied with Cortot and Kempff, and wrote her doctoral dissertation on Messiaen (she was acquainted with both him and his wife). I have not yet discussed Bertin with her yet, but I or you should. Madeleine's aunt was an opera singer, her first teacher, and friendly with Faure and other major French opera composers! She knows an enormous amount about French music and culture, in which she is rooted, so if you have questions, I can put you in touch with her.

I think that it is important - in addition to the British authors, who are wonderful - that you read more deeply in Hugo to gain a certain familiarity with his work. English translations are OK.

By the way, are you familiar with Elizabeth Gaskell, who wrote the first biography of Charlotte Bronte, which is still highly regarded?

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elizabeth_Gaskell

She was more mid-19th century than Austin, who is both 18th and 19th century in her outlook. Gaskell was an amazingly good writer, and interesting person! She was one of my father's favorite writers.

Another French author I would recommend that you read (in addition to Hugo) is Balzac, a superb writer with tremendous breadth.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Honor%C3%A9_de_Balzac

Did you finish reading the dissertation on Bertin? It has a wealth of background information, and also good observations about the musical surface.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sat, Jul 15,
2017, 6:00 PM

to me

Dr. Jackson,

Great! I'll have to ask you to sign two forms (one is my major contract, which I went over with Dr. Conlon, and the other is the Request for Designation of Advisory Committee). When will you be on campus next? It's not horribly urgent, so I can get it whenever you happen to have prior business at UNT. I think I'll ask Drs. Bakulina and Schwarz to be my second and third members.

Wow, that's a fantastic connection! Allow me to consider some queries and I'll let you know. I'd primarily just be interested if she knows of Bertin. There are some political aspects concerning the family that I want to know more about after reading the Boneau dissertation. It seems clear now that the reputation of the family, along with some actual shortcomings of the opera, resulted in the bad reception of the opera more than any other controversy. From what I read, their paper took a royalist stance that wasn't popular with everyone. But considering that the paper hasn't existed in any form since the German Occupation, she may not have much knowledge of the family, as prominent as they were. I'd also (almost more so) be curious to know her insights on Cesar Franck, considering her close proximity (and surely her mother's, since she was friendly with Faure) to that time and circle. I performed Franck's Variations Symphoniques for my Senior recital and I've loved him ever since.

Yes, I plan to raid the third floor of our library for Hugo biographies next time I'm in town. Also, books on the cathedral couldn't hurt.

I've never read Gaskell, but I see her works in my iBooks so I'll take a look.

I've read the dissertation by now, but I need to go through again because I read it kind of casually and I usually take notes on things that I read when I know I need to use the info later. The biographical information is very thorough, especially concerning her relationship with Hugo and their collaboration; I thought the commentary on the musical elements was good for what the paper was (that is, non-theoretical). I felt it sometimes fell into the trap of a lot of music criticism where they don't exactly know how to talk about phrase-structure (works like Lerndahl and Jackendoff's, and Rothstein's were just coming out around 1989) so they resort to kind of vague language -- like calling the phrases "fluid," "organic," or "short-winded." But there were also good observations and I appreciated all the name dropping of other composers when they discussed Bertin's stylistic similarities and differences. Thanks, Levi Walls

Levi wrote his thesis under me. There are many emails about it, which I do not include here. I spent huge blocks of time correcting its language and substance. He asked me to recommend him for the doctoral program, which I did in Nov. 2017:

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Nov 30,
2017, 2:03 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

How are things coming along with your analysis of "L'Esmeralda?" Would you like to meet tomorrow to continue going through it?

I submitted the following letter (I usually share letters of recommendation with the people for whom I write them so that the process is transparent):

It is with pleasure that I write in the strongest support of Levi Walls's application for a place in the doctoral program in Music Theory at the University of North Texas. This is, in fact, a very easy recommendation to write since Levi is a truly excellent all-round student. He is currently writing his Masters thesis on the opera "L'Esmeralda" by Louise Bertin (based on a libretto by Victor Hugo) under my supervision. I can report that he has made tremendous progress this semester and is on his way to completing a first-class study of the structure of this opera and its connection with the plot (based on Hugo's famous novel, *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*). There is no doubt that Levi is currently one of our strongest Masters students, and I am fully confident that he will prosper in the doctoral program going forward. I have heard that he is an excellent student from all of the other professors with whom he has studied, without any exception, which does not surprise me in the least given what I know of him and his work. Levi enjoys my full and unqualified backing as he progresses with his studies.

Timothy L. Jackson

Distinguished University Research Professor of Music Theory

Professor of Music Theory

College of Music

University of North Texas

Denton, TX 76203 USA

Walls Levi <leviWalls@mv.unt.edu>

Thu, Nov 30,

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Thank you for the letter and support! My analysis is coming along well, although I won't have the free time to meet tomorrow; my students have a test on Monday and I'm having extra office hours. Predictably, they have a lot of trouble with the 6/4 types. Could we meet Monday at 10?

In other news, I'm working on absorbing more repertoire and decided to organize a weekly list, focusing on about an hours worth of music for a composer each day. I thought you'd be interested in my list for next week (attached). Until Monday, I'm looking at the composers you mentioned on Monday.

Regards,

Levi Walls

I searched out a possible award for him to conduct research in France:

Fri, Dec 15, 2017,
10:31 PM

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

to levi, Levi

Dear Levi,

I am wondering whether you might apply for this award to conduct research in Paris at the Bibliothek Nationale on Bertain.

What do you think?

Best, Tim

Finishing the Semester

Inbo
x

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sun, Apr 22,
2018, 3:37 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Let's plan to meet next at the end of finals week (5/11). I know that's a big gap, but I need some time to focus on some other papers (one on the emergence of triadic harmony in Renaissance music for Lavacek, and one analyzing the first movement of Elfrida Andree's piano quintet for Cubero). I'm still working on the thesis daily of course, but I have a lot of work to finish for classes. Also, I'm doing a piano jury this semester and need to practice. Thanks!

P.S. Could you please send me your work on punctuation form?

Here's a link to that quintet I mentioned. It reminds me of Mahler, and also Mendelssohn.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-WE1p4k3qkg>

to me

Levi finished and defended his thesis. To increase his knowledge of the repertoire of French opera, I loaned him my own personal CDS of rare recordings:

French operas

Inbo
x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sat, Jul 21,
2018, 12:27 PM

to Levi, Levi

Dear Levi,

How are things going with French opera?

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sat, Jul 21,
2018, 4:30 PM

to me, Levi

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Things are fine. I haven't gotten to all the cds you lent me, although I've made copies. I listened to Les Deux Journees with the full score and Lodoiska is next. Les Deux Journees is not as complex as La Esmeralda, but there are still worthwhile moments; I especially liked the act 1 finale, which is in Eb but starts with an auxiliary cadence (V) before going I-III ♯ 3-V/II-II-IV-V-I. So, it was the most fleshed-out in terms of large-scale structure. When I listen with a score, I like to make notes on an index card about tonal structure for later; that didn't necessarily lead to any profound conclusions with Les Deux Journees, but the preliminary data is at least there for me to look at if I make a more detailed study later. Tonal structure and form is obviously so important for understanding a composition, so I'm trying to build up a rolodex of these index cards. There was some discrepancy between the recording and the score. The recording cut out no. 8 (a melodrama) which was weird because it was only 26 measures long and taking it out obviously changed the tonal structure. The other thing was that Constance's act 3 aria was missing from both the full score and the vocal score, but it was pretty steadily in Bb, so I could still include it in my notes.

I watched Bleak House and you were right, it was incredible! A great production, and clearly a fantastic work. Dickens is so good at writing altruistic characters (like John Jarndyce) and, at the same time, he can write characters that are basically the devil (like Tulkinghorn). They're both very interesting, although each is really stock character (but you could say that every character imaginable is at least a variation on a stock character). His ability to write both so well makes A Christmas Carol (which, not caring much for Christmas, I never liked) more interesting to me because he manages to write a character that expresses both stock types.

We should set up a time that I can return your cds (including the big book). I made copies of everything, which will really come in handy. I'm leaving for California in less than a week to visit

my in-laws, although I'm sure I'll spend a lot of my time there studying. They won't mind. Are you available on Tuesday for me to drop by?

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 21, 2018 10:27:01 AM
To: Walls, Levi; Levi Walls
Subject: [EXT] French operas

In the summers, Levi visited my house for private consultations. I also lent him my own DVDs of dramatizations of 19th century English novels:

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sat, Jul 21,
2018, 6:48 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Tuesday should work. I think that Heejung teaches in the afternoon, so perhaps the later morning would be best.

Just a brief reply for now. I am pleased that you enjoyed Bleak House - it is both a great book and wonderful dramatization that truly captures the essence of Dickens' original novel.

Is there a DVD of the dramatization of George Elliott's *Daniel Deronda* in there? It too is superb. If it is not there, I will look for it and lend it to you when you come.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sat, Jul 21,
2018, 7:28 PM

to me

Yep, Daniel Deronda is in there. How about 11 o'clock on Tuesday?

- Levi Walls

Eichner, father and daughter

Inbo

x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Jul 31,
2018, 12:24 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I thought that this information about A M Eichner might interest you.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adelheid_Maria_Eichner#Works

In my article on "Punctuation Form" I discuss the MP 1 of her father Ernst Eichner's Symphony in G minor.

Now, for the follow-up article, I have been studying and analyzing the rest of the movement (MP 2-3). It is really fine. Clearly, Eichner (father) was a top-class composer.

Now the daughter's music - her Lieder - is published in a modern edition, but as far as I can tell, there is no recording - yet!

I am going to get the Lieder scores and take a look. Apparently, the daughter received superb musical training from the father, and became famous as a virtuoso singer AND pianist.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Tue, Jul 31,
2018, 3:44 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Thanks for the email. I'd like to see those lieder scores at some point. You might be interested in this composer: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elfrida_Andrée

She was quite accomplished as an organist and activist, and I like her music, especially her piano quintet. I might have mentioned her before. Here's a link to her complete solo piano works: https://m.youtube.com/results?search_query=elfrida+andree+piano+works I'd like to look at her opera, but it doesn't seem to be published aside from some arias in a collection of various Swedish works.

Working on the article has taken a backseat to studying for entrance exams and quals (also I'm in California with family) but it's on my mind. I really need to start publishing soon in order to be competitive.

I most recently read Anna Karenina, The Hunger Artist, and a collection of Tolstoy short stories, so you could say I'm on a Russian kick at the moment. I read something recently that said Kafka's works, which often center around a character who is wrongly persecuted or made to feel worthless by an indifferent force, were his way of working out his feelings towards his abusive father; but I think that interpretation may be reading too far into his biography. It's possibly better to say that his pessimism simply fits into the realist and naturalist movements of the time. But maybe there is also something to the biographical component.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 10:24:59 AM
To: Walls, Levi
Subject: [EXT] Eichner, father and daughter

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sat, Aug 25,
2018, 1:03 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Since you have an interest in women composers, I thought that I would forward this information about the Russian-Jewish composer Zara Levina. The new CD of her piano concertos has been nominated for a Grammy. I have to delve into her music more carefully, but my initial impression is very positive, especially of the later, Second Piano Concerto.

<https://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2086/catalogue/item.asp?cid=C5269>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zara_Levina

<https://theaderks.wordpress.com/2017/12/28/zara-levina-piano-concertos-rachmaninov-meets-shostakovich/>

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mon, Aug 27,
2018, 6:18 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

This is great! Her harmonies (especially in the piano sonata) give me a very unique feeling in the core of my brain that, previously, only Prokofiev had managed. Both concertos are great, but I actually prefer 1 to 2, though it is hard to say why. I'm definitely showing Levina to my young aural skills students as part of my attempts to widen their musical purviews!

Here's something by Elisabeth Lutyens, a British serialist:
<https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=73kMX1ENUEo>
She claimed to have developed her style without the influence of the second Viennese school of composers, which she said she only became aware of afterwards. However, I feel that she may have been taking a leaf from Wagner's book by mythologizing her own musical upbringing. She seems to have a liking for symmetrical structures. You may hear that in the piece I posted, but also in her larger work, Quincunx, which involves symmetrical 5-part groupings of sections (like a Quincunx).

Regards, Levi Walls

Ruth Gipps

Inbo
x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sun, Sep 23,
2018, 11:40 PM

to Levi

<https://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2086/catalogue/item.asp?cid=CHAN20078>

I thought that this new release from Chandos of Ruth Gipps might interest you.....

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mon, Sep 24,
2018, 2:55 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Yes, thank you, I'll check this out. I appreciate your emails, especially since I know you're busy! I read Dr. Murtomaki's article on the neglect of Bohemian composers, which was informative and gave me a good long list of new composers to check out. Currently reading Latham's *Tonality as Drama*, which I've referenced before but not yet read in full. I think there is a lot in there that I can use to inform my own research on opera. And for the first time in a while, I'm practicing piano regularly. And analysis of course.

I recently discovered an online resource that I knew you would appreciate. It's a database of thousands of composers who are female or from non-European/US countries. In general, just composers from outside the canon, and you can search by genre and instrumentation! Of course, there are so many European male composers who are also overlooked, but this database chooses to focus on those other groups.

<https://composerdiversity.com>

Regards, Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 23, 2018 9:40:38 PM
To: Walls, Levi
Subject: [EXT] Ruth Gipps

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 25,
2018, 11:23 AM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Thank-you for all of this interesting information!

Here a little tidbit: In 1830, Hummel gave three concerts in Paris; at one of them, a rondo by Hummel was performed by Aristide Farrenc's wife, the composer [Louise Farrenc](#), who also "sought Hummel's comments on her keyboard technique."

Best wishes, Tim



ReplyForward

Maria Teresa Prieto

Inbo
x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, Dec 14,
2018, 8:57 PM

to Levi

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cKkkKZyUn1PU&list=PLshMjd9c4cQZNZ7fXJCJxyg4-hTevojth>

Dear Levi,

Have you heard of this composer?

Best, Tim

Attachments area

Preview YouTube video Impresion sinfonica



Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sat, Dec 15,
2018, 7:21 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

I had not. I'll listen to more of her music today. I see that she studied with Milhaud. I went into the piece you sent expecting to hear a mixture of the French and Spanish styles, but the first half actually reminds me a lot of Tristan (which is funny considering Milhaud's antipathy towards Wagner's music). But, of course, that dislike wouldn't necessarily have been inherited by Prieto, and even composers who purportedly had a distaste for Wagner still exhibited his influence (like Franck and his D major string quartet, although I've heard it argued that he's actually mocking Wagner in that case). The key structure of Prieto's piece seems interesting. I don't have music in front of me, but it seems to begin and end in G major although, in both cases, the voicing of the chord substantially weakens the strength of tonic. Then there's the big half cadence in the relative minor (around the 7-minute mark) before a rather shocking move to G minor. Since she really draws out the half cadence, it seems clear that she wants to draw as much attention as possible to the lack of resolution. If I were analyzing it, I'd probably look for evidence of tonal pairing between G and E minor and maybe between G and B major. But I'd have to be prepared to relinquish that theory if the score didn't support it since I'm basing so much off of an initial hearing. Thanks for sending it to me!

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, December 14, 2018 6:57:36 PM

To: Walls, Levi

Subject: [EXT] Maria Teresa Prieto

Your card

Inbo
x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 5,
2019, 8:25 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I want to thank you for your very kind card, which Stephen Hahn brought with him when he visited me on Monday.

In January I suddenly had increasingly excruciating pain in my groin and my right leg, which only became worse and worse.

The doctors noticed problems with my spine, but they also thought that I might have a hernia. It was not until I was able to have a MRI done of both my lower back and groin areas that the hernia could be definitively ruled out; however, it turned out that I have three problematic discs in my back, and these were and are affecting nerves in the groin area and in my right leg.

A month ago, I had the first of two spinal injections to reduce the inflammation, which alleviated the terrible pain, and two weeks ago, I had the second shot. On this Thursday, I will meet the specialist to discuss the next steps. It is clear that I will need to have physical therapy, and perhaps further procedures to deal with "collateral damage" to the nerves in my leg. At present, it is difficult and painful to sit at the computer too long, so that I have mainly been occupied analyzing music on my back, consoling myself with the thought that I might be a bit like Michelangelo working on the frescoes in the Sistine Chapel, and hopefully have just a tiny modicum of his talent!

One of the things I have done is to have a crack at analyzing Dora Pejacevic's Second Piano Sonata, which I think is a superb work. Also, of late, I have been analyzing the music of Polish composers: Paderewski, Szymanowski, and Bortkiewicz (although the Ukrainians claim him!).

How are your courses going? I do miss our lively and interesting discussions! Have you thought more about your dissertation topic, and research interests?

It would be nice to hear from you.

With best regards,

Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Wed, Mar 6,
2019, 10:05 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Thanks for the update. That sounds incredibly uncomfortable, but I'm glad you're finding ways to work through it.

Courses are going well. I'm in the last part of analytical systems, where I got to give a very interesting presentation on major philosophical inspirations in Schenker's work. So, I got to talk a lot about Kant, Schopenhauer, Leibniz, and Goethe. I'm also in a rock music seminar with Dr. Heetderks and a scholarly writing class in the English department. My writing has improved significantly since my thesis.

In the scholarly writing class, we spend all semester workshopping a single paper, with the end goal being to submit it to a journal. I've been writing a paper on the historical circumstances that have held back Schenkerian approaches to opera, focusing on Schenker's myopia, formalism, and the false dichotomy of absolute and programmatic music. I also feel that the rejection of Alfred Lorenz has contributed somewhat to the issue. Even though he wasn't a Schenkerian, he argues for the possibility of unity in opera (or, at least, in Wagner's operas) and theorists seem keen on sacrificing his approach on a political altar. Of course, I have to be careful to frame that facet of the issue in the right way. In general, I have to be especially careful.

Another paper I've had simmering is a little outside my normal research interests but it's good to work a little with canonized repertoire. I haven't yet done much with it because I came up with it spontaneously while listening to Brahms's second piano concerto in concert. Brahms seems to take a simple triplet from the first movement, evolve it into a 2/3 grouping dissonance in the second movement, making it more pronounced in the third, then finally creates a somewhat jarring subconscious grouping dissonance (Krebs's term) in the last movement. But I need to check what others have written about it.

Other than my normal studies and research, I've been reading a lot. Trying to get through a book a week. Out of the 10 or so that I've in the last two months, my favorite has been *Wives and Daughters* by Gaskell; I was so sad when it ended before Molly

and Roger finally got together (since Gaskell died before finishing it). At the moment I'm reading *You Can't Go Home Again* by Thomas Wolfe. So far it seems to be an exposé of decadence during the roaring 20s.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 6:25:48 PM
To: Walls, Levi
Subject: [EXT] Your card

Levi is giving a paper at the Society for Music Theory this November on Berlioz's opera *Les Troyens*. The topic and the analysis itself grew out of his work with me:

Les Troyens

Inbo
x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Wed, Mar 13,
2019, 2:17 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I have been watching the 1983 Met production of Berlioz's *Les Troyens*. Jessye Norman as Cassandra is amazing! Wow!

My feeling is that this opera is Berlioz's greatest work. It probably is the best French opera of all time.

Full and vocal scores are on IMSLP.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Wed, Mar 13,
2019, 9:55 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Thanks for the emails! I'm still looking through your Szymanowski materials that you were kind enough to send; I got extremely engulfed in the book I was reading, but I've now finished it. I can already see/hear the centrality of C in the third act. I'll enjoy following your analysis. I notice (just listening, *sans* score) that the first act also seems to center around C and E as you suggested. To start, the chorus and bass seem to emphasize B, then C#, then A, but these first few minutes seem more like a prelude. So, the "real" beginning (so to speak) would be the huge crescendo that arrives on a triumphant C major sonority, which is also when the tenor comes in with that third progression. And it sounds like it keeps coming back until the first act finally ends in C. Very interesting.

I have the 2010 Dutch National Opera video recording of *Les Troyens*, and the 1970 Colin Davis Royal Opera House recording on vinyl. You might be interested in a part of the insert from the record, which includes excerpts of letters/memoirs regarding the opera. I'll attach pictures here (font may be small, but you'll be able to zoom in if you download them).

The end of the first part (*La prise de Troie*) is very interesting because it seems as if it is going to end in FM (the key of the prelude for the second part) but then it somewhat abruptly ends in Cm. Because of this, both parts feature a V-I key relationship from beginning to end (*La prise de Troie* starts in G and ends in Cm, while *Les Troyens* starts in F and ends in Bb). Since I haven't graphed the opera, it's more of a casual observation than a serious hypothesis, but those key relations make a lot of large-scale tonal sense (In Bb, V/ii-ii-V-I). Could be something there. I'll have to keep the opera in mind, especially since Berlioz fits very nicely into my research interests. He's one of the composers that has a clear love and appreciation of literature.

Regards,

Levi

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2019 12:17:39 PM

To: Walls, Levi
Subject: [EXT] Les Troyens

4 Attachments

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 14,
2019, 9:07 AM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I will look at the tonal structure in light of your comments. I have the vinyl Colin Davis and will check the notes (thank you for the photos). I also have Dutoit's recording on cd.

Is the 2010 dvd good?

Everything you are hearing in King Roger is correct! The opera begins with a big aux cadence to C. Perhaps Szymanowski learned this from studying Strauss' Electra, which does the same except in C minor.

I think that Les Troyens would be well worth an in depth study along the lines of your investigation of Bertin!

Berlioz's libretto is masterly! It reflects his literary sophistication.

Best wishes,

Tim
Sent from my iPhone

Notre-dame

Inbo
x

Levi

Schenkerian Studies TA

Inbo

Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>

Mon, Apr 22,
2019, 9:50 AM

to me, Stephen, Benjamin

Tim, Stephen, and Benjamin,

I wrote to Levi and he already responded; he has accepted the position. I am sure he will thrive in the in his new role and I look forward to mentoring him starting in August/September!

Best,
Ben

Benjamin Graf, Ph.D.

University of North Texas

Music History, Theory and Ethnomusicology

Office: MU215



Brand, Benjamin <Benjamin.Brand@unt.edu>

Mon, Apr 22, 2019,
11:03 AM

to Benjamin, me, Stephen

Thank you, Ben. To reiterate, Levi's appointment is still conditional on our ability to cover aural skills. Once that is confirmed, I would ask that Tim, Stephen, and you formulate a job description that clearly specifies Levi's duties. I am attaching a similar document that Frank created for the *Theoria* TA position for the sake of comparison.

Best,
Benjamin

Benjamin Brand | Professor of Music History | Chair, Division of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology
College of Music | University of North Texas | 1155 Union Circle #311367 | Denton, TX 76203 | (940) 536-3561

Attachments area

Berlioz

Inbo
x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, May 10,
2019, 10:21 AM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

If you find yourself liberated, and are interested, I would like to look at some Berlioz with you.

I have worked on the outer sections of Cleopatre. If you would like to analyze them on your own, then we could compare readings. What do you think?

At some point, I am keen to go through parts of Les Troyens. In my opinion, this opera is Berlioz at his very best! Parts of it are just stupendous.

Also, I did some analysis of the Second Piano Sonata by Pejacevik; it is very unusual and fascinating. I have been working with Juana Montsalve on her doctoral dissertation on Maria Theresa Prieto, with a focus on her song cycle, and that has proven fascinating. Juana won a grant to do some archival digging in Mexico about Prieto, and she is leaving for Mexico next week.

With best wishes, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Fri, May 10,
2019, 1:02 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Yes, looking at some Berlioz sounds nice. I'm finally done with the semester, so I can start my summer studies. I'll go print out the score for Cleopatre so I can analyze it on the large papers and we can compare. We can also talk about Les Troyens.

Have you ever analyzed Berlioz's La Damnation de Faust? I'm interested in Les Troyens, naturally, but I'd like to analyze the Faust opera. Faust has always been a character that interests me. I identify with Faust at the beginning of the work (not so much after he signs the contract and adopts his Hedonistic lifestyle). On a related note, I'm reading Doctor Faustus by Mann. It's been on my list!

Regards,

Levi

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2019 8:21:00 AM
To: Walls, Levi
Subject: [EXT] Berlioz

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, May 10,
2019, 1:09 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I have not analyzed the Berlioz Damnation although I have also been interested in it for a long time. So, why not Cleopatre first and then Damnation. There are also the Schumann Scenes from Faust, and Mahler's Eighth Symphony Part II. I have studied the Mahler very carefully, and also gone through the Schumann too superficially - but enough to believe it is one of Schumann's really strong pieces. I have also studied Liszt's Faust Symphony in depth.

I will pull out my score of the Damnation.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Fri, May 17,
2019, 8:52 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

I'm most interested in the fact that the opera follows a very similar tonal trajectory to La Esmeralda, starting in D major and centering around a tonal pairing between D major and F major. This is consistent for the first three acts. It's not until the fourth act that things go off the rails. Of course, act four is where things go sour in this version of the story. Marguerite, having accidentally killed her mother, is in prison and Faust must sign away his soul in order to save her. At this point in the opera, the tonal structure turns to darker keys, focusing on Ab and Db major. So, the opera ends in Db instead of D. As we've discussed before, I see downward semitonal shifts as tragic in nature.

The tonal similarities to La Esmeralda (with D major and F major as focal points) is especially interesting since Berlioz wrote La Damnation afterwards. Of course, Berlioz would have been extremely familiar with the score since he edited it. Furthermore, the only other adaptation of Faust to move the contract signing to the end of the story (which makes Faust a more sympathetic character) is Bertin's.

Beginnings and endings are sine qua non to understanding the deeper meaning of any story, but I'm starting by examining act 2 and the first part of act 3. Act 2 is almost entirely in D major, which is obviously very unusual (and important); from there, it moves to F major (once again).

Did you want to get together sometime to talk about opera? I'm unable to travel Friday through Sunday because my wife works all day and has our only car, but I'm available the other days of the week. And, of course, I'm always walking distance from campus. I'm working on fixing the css site this month, so I'll give you an update in a week or so.

Regards,

Levi

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2019 9:13:29 PM

To: Walls, Levi

Subject: [EXT] Which part of the "Damnation" to study?

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, May 17,
2019, 10:07 AM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

That is very interesting indeed! I see your point now. Yes! I do understand exactly what you are getting at.

I had in mind that you might want to analyze one or two of the parts of "Damnation" in detail, because there are many interesting motivic, harmonic, and other features. My preference would be the Third and Fourth Parts if you are up for it.

Otherwise, my preference would be to dive into Les Troyens, which I consider Berlioz's supreme achievement.

What do you think?

I am in the process of moving into a new house, so my books, CDs, scores, etc. are all in boxes. Still, life and thought go on, and I feel it is important to dig deeper into Berlioz.

We could meet when you have mobility.

Also, have you had a chance to look through the outer sections of Cleopatre? It is worthy of study.

Best wishes, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Fri, May 17,
2019, 1:09 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Yes, I've been going through Cleopatre. It's starting to make more sense. I have ideas about the overall structure, which I currently read as a massive II-V-I auxiliary cadence in Ab. Key areas like B major and F minor function as contrapuntal

embellishments on Eb and Ab major, respectively. At the moment, I'll hold off on saying more until I have graphs in order. Perhaps we can meet during the week next week.

Sure, I can analyze the 3rd and 4th parts of Faust. That would show the movement from D to Db pretty clearly. I'll keep Les Troyens in mind, though. I'm interested in both operas; Faust is just winning by a nose. Looking at an old email, I realized that I forgot to answer your question about the 2010 recording of Les Troyens. The production quality is really high, but I'm lukewarm about the set and costume design. It's just a bit minimalistic for my tastes. The chorus could have been more together, as well, but I'm really nitpicking. Overall, it's a fine recording.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2019 8:07:13 AM
To: Walls, Levi
Subject: Re: [EXT] Which part of the "Damnation" to study?

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, May 17,
2019, 7:19 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Let's meet next week, if possible, to discuss Cleopatre. I will start looking deeper into the last parts of "Damnation," time permitting.

I might want to make a trip to Houston next week to see the amazing exhibition of Van Gogh paintings there - a once in a life time opportunity, apparently. You might want to see it.

I don't know if I mentioned that we are moving to a new house at the end of the month. So, lots of boxes are around and most of my library is packed up! But I kept out my score of "Damnation."

Best wishes, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sat, May 18,
2019, 2:09 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Yes, let's meet on Thursday, if that works for you. Perhaps 1 pm?

Moving is the worst! Thanks for keeping the Damnation score at hand, and for encouraging my research interests!

Regards,

Levi

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2019 5:19:14 PM

To: Walls, Levi

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, May 21,
2019, 7:39 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I will see you on Thursday at 1pm.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Tue, May 21,
2019, 8:30 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Great, I'll see you then, and I'll bring my *Cleopatre* graphs!

Regards,

Levi Walls

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sat, May 25,
2019, 10:45 AM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I fully agree with your auxiliary-cadence analysis of *Cleopatre* as II-V-I in Ab major! Bravo! The difficult question (as I see it) is, what precisely is the meaning of the F minor episode, and how does it fit into this overarching background scheme? Also, there are many, many complexities in the opening Bb *minor* (in spite of the key signature) section, the Eb major section, and then the motion from Eb major to F minor, and F minor to Ab major. After intensive struggle, I now have an idea as to how to explain the voice leading connections, and it will be most interested to compare my reading with yours. The delay in meeting was good. I was unhappy with my earlier analysis. Now I think that I have something much better!

Before I forget, I should alert you to the upcoming Euromac 10 Music Analysis Conference in Moscow. I think that you definitely should put in a proposal. It would be a good place to scout out some future submissions to the JSS.

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sun, May 26,
2019, 2:20 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

I'm glad you agree. Yes, that reading seems especially appropriate considering the *in medias res* nature of the text.

Yes, thank you for the heads up. I will definitely submit a proposal for that conference, along with others.

I wasn't very familiar with settings of Whitman until a few months ago. A student in the scholarly writing class was doing research on Whitman and opera and asked for some feedback, so I did some listening at that time. I especially like the reconciliation section of *Dona nobis pacem*. I feel that Williams really grasped the meaning of the text, as evidenced by the three-fold repetition of the first half. It's first experienced by the individual (baritone), then the individual is subsumed into the collective (chorus), as is the case with war. The third varied repetition may represent the arrival of a new, fresh, collective, as if the "washing of the soiled world" took place during the second half of the poem. "Reconciliation" seems like a very interesting poem for Whitman (or, at least, how I tend to think of him). It's definitely not pro-war, but it also accepts war as a necessary evil.

Wednesday at 2 is good for me. I'll see you then! I assume it's at your previous address (Woodside Drive in Highland Hills), rather than the new one. Let me know if I should go to the new house.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2019 8:45:06 AM

To: Walls, Levi

Subject: [EXT] Re: Feeling sick today

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sun, May 26,
2019, 3:52 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

We don't close on the new house until Thursday. Still, I have been distracted a bit with packing up my library.

I like VW's Whitman settings a lot; he seems to capture something essential in the poetry. Interesting that you notice an acceptance of war as a necessary evil. The piece was composed at a time when VW was really struggling - as were many in Britain - with the possibility of another war with Germany - this time with Hitler's Germany. VW was involved with settling German-Jewish refugees coming to England, so that he knew first hand what the Nazis were doing to the Jews - the Jews being the canaries of the world. Like most Europeans - non Germans - at that time, VW did not want another war. Therefore, I believe that he was drawn in two directions: on the one hand, to want to avoid conflict, and on the other perceiving the necessity of confronting the bully, and this tension is felt in the work. Then there is the whole episode of the Hamburg Prize, which VW accepted from Nazi Germany in the hope of easing tensions, but which left a bitter after-taste - and he never did receive the promised monetary component. The backstory to this prize is extremely interesting and important for understanding VW's works of the later 1930s.

Best wishes, Tim

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Wed, May 29,
2019, 10:00 AM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Just confirming your visit at 2pm today. We are in a bit of disarray, but I am ready to discuss Cleopatre.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Wed, May 29,
2019, 10:49 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Yes, I will be there at 2. See you then!

Regards,

Levi

In May 2019, we were moving. I gave Levi about 600 recordings to help him expand his knowledge of repertoire and study for his qualifying exams. I also gave him stereo equipment that I was not using.

pick of records

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, May 31,
2019, 6:11 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Would you have time this weekend to pick up the records that I have put aside for you?

Best wishes,

Tim

some equipment that works that I don't use

Inbo
x

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Fri, May 31,
2019, 6:17 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I have a projector that works; it is about 12 years old, but still has life left in it. It was excellent quality when I bought it.

Also, I have a Rotel Amplifier that needs a fuse replaced. If you know someone who is good with electronics, they could probably do it. Rotel is a good brand.

Additionally, I have an Adcom Preamp that has an issue with one of the settings - I forget which. At one point, I was thinking of getting it repaired, but then I moved to a higher level of equipment.

If you would like these pieces, then I would be happy to give them to you. Otherwise, I will donate them to Goodwill, which will repair and sell them.

In terms of records, I have about four or five boxes of them!

Best wishes,

Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sat, Jun 1, 2019,
12:30 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Sorry for the delay. Great, I can swing by tomorrow to pick up the records. Normally, I wouldn't have a car but my wife won't be at work because she has bronchitis. So I'll be able to travel tomorrow. I can come by any time tomorrow, but I'll be without a car again on Sunday. I can also take the equipment off your hands. I should be able to put them to some use. Thanks a bunch!

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 4:17:24 PM
To: Walls, Levi
Subject: [EXT] some equipment that works that I don't use

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sat, Jun 1,
2019, 7:31 AM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Would you like to come by around 11?

Best wishes,

Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sat, Jun 1,
2019, 7:33 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Yes, I'll see you then!

Regards,

Levi

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, June 1, 2019 5:31:59 AM

To: Walls, Levi

Subject: Re: [EXT] some equipment that works that I don't use

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sat, Jun 1,
2019, 7:36 AM

to Levi

Great! Make sure that you have room in your car!

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Sat, Jun 1,
2019, 8:51 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

I'm okay! I have a baby grand at home, which was a generous gift from a patron when I lived in California. I'm also good on screens, printers, and storage. Very much appreciated though.

Again, thanks so much for the records! I already got a new bookcase for them and all the operas are now organized. One more bookcase should do it. Oh no, not overwhelmed at all. I can't wait to dive into all the recordings/inserts.

I'll be in touch about Berlioz/research.

Regards,

Levi Walls

Regarding the Symposium, Levi and Ben asked me if Clark, Beaudoin and Lett responses should be published; I agreed that they should be published in fairness to have both sides, and they were.

Clark, Beaudoin, and Lett responses

Inbo
x

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Thu, Feb 13,
10:54 AM

to me, benjamingraf@unt.edu

Dear Dr. Jackson (with Dr. Graf in copy; Dr. Slottow not copied because he asked to be recused),

Dr. Graf and I were wondering what your thoughts were concerning the submissions from Clark, Beaudoin, and Lett. As you may have seen, these responses are (at least) implicitly anti-Schenkerian. Despite disagreeing with much of what they have to say, Dr. Graf and I think it is important to publish these responses along with the others that we have received (Wiener, Pomeroy, Wen, Cadwallader, etc.). We wouldn't want the *JSS*'s account of the debate to appear one-sided, and having a mixture of opinions will lend more credibility to those responses that we do agree with. Just want to check in with you before we proceed!

And thank you for all your time and effort in getting responses from prominent names in the field!

Regards,

Levi Walls

recommendation for conference

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Wed, Feb 19,
8:57 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

So..... this afternoon I did receive an email requesting my approval for your application, to which I have responded with the highest possible numerical ranking.

I am unsure whether I have to write a more detailed letter of support, and have written to Dr. Brand to see. Just in case I do need to craft an actual letter, might you send me your abstract and details about the conference, which I will need for my letter.

Today I picked up a recording of Berlioz's Beatrice and Benedict: https://www.amazon.com/BERLIOZ-BEATRICE-BENEDICT-JOHN-NELSON/dp/B00007M8T1/ref=sr_1_3?keywords=Beatrice+and+benedict+nelson&qid=1582167159&s=music&sr=1-3

It seems very good indeed.

The cycles in the Bertain are clearly damaged; but, I wonder if they are in the Berlioz *Les Troyens*? Perhaps, in the latter, the opposite might be the case?

Best, Tim

As Levi's advisor in the doctoral program, the Chair Benjamin Brand asked me for a letter of support for his application for travel funding to present his work in England. I wrote such a letter:

Walls U.K. travel funding

Inbo
x

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Tue, Feb 18,
4:55 PM

to me

Dear dr. Jackson,

I think dr. Brand sent you an email (as my advisor) regarding the request I put in for funding to go to the U.K. I believe he requires a response from you before the request can go through. Thanks!

Regards,

Levi Walls

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 18,
7:52 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I looked through my webmail account under Brand, but I don't see any communication about this travel funding for you. Plus, I do not recall writing a letter of recommendation for your travel, nor reading your application! I did assist another student with an application for travel funding, but not you!

If you received a note from him about this application, could you please forward it to me, along with a copy of your application.

I hope that senility has not accelerated at light speed!

Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Tue, Feb 18,
8:52 PM

to me

Dear dr. Jackson,

Yeah, I was surprised when he said he needed your feedback. I'm not sure why. He mentioned it in passing today. Hopefully, it requires nothing more than for you to push a button and submit. I'll email him.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 5:52:27 PM

To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Subject: [EXT] Re: Walls U.K. travel funding

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Tue, Feb 18,
9:06 PM

to me

I emailed him to reach out to you. Apologies, I would have given you more heads up if I had known any action was required on your end. I only knew about it because he mentioned it when I ran into him today.

- Levi Walls

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 6:52:43 PM
To: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: [EXT] Re: Walls U.K. travel funding

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 18,
9:20 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

I would like more information. I don't recall you mentioning a travel application to the UK; rather, I thought that you were interested in France! So, why England?

Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Tue, Feb 18,
9:25 PM

to me

Dear dr. Jackson,

Oh, yes, it's for the international conference of musical form on June 30 that I was accepted into. Just to help with the funding to get to the conference. Nothing substantial like the planned work in France.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 7:20:01 PM

To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Subject: Re: [EXT] Re: Walls U.K. travel funding

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 18,
9:34 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

OK. That is totally different from the student *research* grant application (I believe that I sent you the call for applications for that competition thinking you might want to go to Paris). Well, of course I will strongly support your application for travel funding to present at the British conference. But, as I said, I have not heard a peep from Brand about that. Maybe he does not need my input to make a decision.....

Keep me posted regardless.

By the way, if you have a chance to make a pit stop at the British Library near Charing Cross in London to photograph something for me, I would be infinitely grateful. But only if you have time. Their music collection is spectacular and important, and a resource that you should be familiar with! I have spent many happy hours puttering around there.

Best, Tim

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Thu, Feb 20,
8:15 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Thanks for taking care of the funding request. Hopefully Brand doesn't require much more from you as I don't wish to inconvenience you without warning! Of course I'm happy help you by making a stop at the British Library. I'll be staying with a friend in London and commuting to Newcastle from there (which will be cheaper in the end), so the Charing Cross library won't be too out of the way. What is it that you would like me to photograph?

Regards,

Levi Walls

Cordial relations with Levi persisted for nearly five months *after* the Symposium was submitted to UNT press, and we were assembling the next issue. Levi's daughter was born. There was no sign of any issues or concerns.

I sent Levi a project that I was working on:

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

May 19,
2020, 10:01
AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Thanks for your email, and the detailed graphs. Since musical setting is, itself, a translation of sorts, these pieces would seem to offer an especially interesting challenge (a Wellesz translation of Rilke's translation of E.B. Browning, like a game of "telephone"). Technically, there are four levels (or at least three and a half) to the process because Rilke didn't know English and was assisted by his hostess in Capri. If you haven't already, there are a few articles that you might find useful, especially in regards to the relationship between Rilke's and Browning's texts.

"Rilke's Translations of English, French, and Italian Sonnets" by Furst: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/4172561.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Ad54da7f70c99859abb26629bc5b5c137>

and "Translating Desire: Elizabeth Barrett-Browning and Rilke's women in love" by Catling (although I couldn't manage to find this article, which appears in a German-language book called *Rilke und die Moderne*). <https://ueaeprints.uea.ac.uk/id/eprint/26337/> It seems like it would be useful if it can be tracked down. I'm unsure of the state of ILL during this shutdown.

Part of the Furst article mentions that, because Rilke changes the structure of the sonnets he translates, the resultant rhyme scheme "gains a musical and symbolical element" that wasn't necessarily there before (132). According to the author, this change is due in part to Rilke's alternating use of masculine and feminine rhymes, whereas Browning's rhymes are consistently masculine. I wonder if the translations set by Wellesz feature similar changes.

Ophelia is well for the most part. My wife works 6pm-6am three days a week, so I am on my own with her those nights. It can be pretty rough (because she cries more when Rebeca is gone) so I often go without sleep. But it's a labor of love. I think, all in all, I'm doing well in fatherhood.

My biggest challenge, as I always thought it would be, is not to be too neglectful because of work. It's a delicate balance.

I'm currently studying for my related field quals, so I'm buried in English literature texts. I think more music theorists would do well to be more familiar with some of these literary theory texts. A few that I've committed to reading are unrepentantly intentionalist though, especially Hirsch's *Validity in Interpretation* (an ironic title, to be sure, because when our analyses are absolutely beholden to the supposed intentions of authors, we might as well throw out the possibility of interpretation). One of the novels I'm currently reading is *Romola*. Knowing your interest in George Eliot and Vasari's *Lives of the Artists*, it seems like a book you would appreciate.

This talk of English literature reminds me. Would you mind signing my degree plan? Just the "major professor" line near the bottom of the front page. You'll have to do it electronically, which should be straightforward using the "annotate" tool of whatever PDF program it opens in. I attached it. Let me know if it gives you trouble. Thanks!

Regards,

Levi Walls

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Stephen Slottow** <sslottow@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, May 14, 2020 at 6:49 PM

Subject: Re: [EXT] Re: Confidential

To: Colin Davis <colindavis@gmail.com>

Cc: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Dear Levi,

That all sounds excellent.

But when should the present issue be out?

-sps

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Mon, Jun 8,
8:49 AM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

Thanks for the email. I'm afraid it's a negative on the sleep issue. She's still pretty fussy at night so I only get an hour here and there.

In regards to your journal questions, I've been emailing Karen at UNT press about the printing, but she hasn't been responding (which is frustrating). Even with the virus, I feel like it's taking too long. I emailed Ron yesterday, so hopefully he will respond. I've been chipping away at the Novack and I've gotten through the first couple files. While I'm at it, I'm also formatting it in Indesign for the journal style. I had a question: should I change the British-style punctuation and spellings (i.e. periods outside of quotation marks and words like "focussed")? I assume the answer is yes, but wanted to double-check. I'll send some of the proofs this week.

Thanks for your kind offer to meet. Always much appreciated. Perhaps sometime later in the summer; now's just not a good time. In a month or so, I'll have finished teaching my summer course (aural skills III), Ophelia will hopefully be sleeping better, and I'll have gotten my massive reading list under control, all of which will significantly improve my sanity.

I'll be presenting my double cycle work at SMT this year, so that will be good.

How have you been doing this summer? How is your family?

Regards,

Levi Walls

PS. Just as I was about to hit send, Ron responded to my email. He said that the printing has been underway but running behind because of the virus. We should have copies by the end of this month, he said.

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 7, 2020 1:29 PM

To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Subject: [EXT] Making contact - Novack text

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Tue, Jun 9,
7:46 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Bravo on the SMT acceptance! Great news indeed! Are they going to hold the meeting physically or on-line? I will not travel this year, considering it just too risky - and expensive, given the cuts to faculty travel funding. I have read some reports indicating that there are patients recovering from the virus who have exhibited lasting damage to their hearts. No one knows the long-term repercussions. It is depressing that the infection rate in the Denton area shows no decline.

<https://gis-covid19-dentoncounty.hub.arcgis.com/pages/covid-19cases>

On the contrary, it is increasing daily!

Thank-you for the update about the *Journal* and the Novack. Good news about the text. Use our house style (American). Once I have that text from you, I will start working with Colin on the examples.

I am teaching "Analysis and Performance" for the first time as a summer course. With 15 students, entirely on-line, it is challenging. However, the good news is that the students are almost all DMAs and highly motivated, so that I think we will make real progress. Right now, we are looking at a scene from Jommelli's opera *Armida abbandonata*, which I believe to be an absolutely amazing opera.

I send you my annotated score with some ideas about how it works.

There is one very significant difference between the two recorded performances, both available on Youtube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F3_skCJBSJg

<https://youtu.be/FrPRKb-xhzY?t=2337>

Both are very good, but Rousset makes a significant cut in the A' section. I am trying to figure out if he made it based on Jommelli, or on his own. It is possible that Jommelli compressed the A' because he revised the opera for different performances.

This opera is one of the truly great Classical operas! I cannot recommend it highly enough!

Your baby will sleep through the night - eventually. Hang in there!

Best, Tim

On July 23, 2020, just six days before the public attack and his subsequent denunciation of me, Levi wrote:

Walls, Levi

Thu, Jul 23,
2:11 PM

to me

Dear Dr. Jackson,

I attached the requested files. Ah, yes, I remember from my first semester at UNT that you were working on the late quartets (op. 131, to be specific). That was back when I barely knew what Schenkerian analysis was. Hard to believe it was only 4 years ago! Let's hope I come just as far in another 4 years.

I'd be interested in seeing your Beethoven work, as with anything. Studying Beethoven will always be important, even if I don't ever plan on presenting/publishing work on him. I always feel a little apprehension at doing Beethoven research. He's been done so much over the years (for good reason, to be sure, as he is without a doubt one of the greatest composers that ever lived). But still, I inwardly groan a little when I see paper after paper on Beethoven at conferences. I think you know what I mean, since you were sitting right next to me when I heard you say something to a similar effect in response to a Beethoven paper at TSMT 2018. But, I'm glad to see what you have to say since, as I said, it's very important to continue studying Beethoven. Something new and valuable might come out of it, and it would be an awful shame if Beethoven research stopped *entirely*.

For my own part, I have a few projects going for the next conference season. I once wrote a paper about finding a musical analogue to Transatlantic Modernism (the Imagist poets, plus the likes of T.S. Eliot and Gertrude Stein). I had noticed that documentaries on these figures used a mixture of classical-romantic era music and Coplandesque Americana, but I argued that it was the music of the second Viennese school that really mirrors the Transatlantic Modernist aesthetic/philosophical views. And it should be the job of a documentary to choose music that represents their subject's aesthetic/philosophical views, when that documentary is on an artist. So I'm reworking that paper for a few American literature conferences. Then, I've recently

started thinking about writing a proposal for upcoming theory/musicology conferences that compares formalism in music vs. formalism in literary theory. Confusingly, the two ideologies are complete opposites when it comes to matters of interpretation. One of our main formalist representatives is Peter Kivy, whose perspective is almost semiotically barren. On the other hand, the main representatives of formalism in literary theory are the New Critics and the Russian Formalists, who are extremely flexible in regards to semiotics. In part, the New Critics pushed Barthes' idea of the "death of the author," which I find indispensable to interpretation (and Kivy found distasteful). I think that the underlying reasons for this disparity between formalism in music and in literary theory will say something important about the ideological differences between the two fields. But that project is in its infancy, so we'll see what happens with it.

Ophelia is okay. She's getting so much smarter and her hand-eye coordination is improving a lot. If I put her on my lap at the piano, she hits the keys with interest, which is very good for a four-month-old! A surprising lack of change in the sleep department, though. But, at least I don't have to take care of her alone at night anymore (at least, for the foreseeable future) because my wife's work schedule changed to daytime shifts.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 9:53 AM
To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Subject: [EXT] Re: Updates on articles, websites, and printing.

...

[Message clipped] [View entire message](#)

3 Attachments

Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Thu, Jul 23,
6:49 PM

to Levi

Dear Levi,

Thank-you for the update. I would like to discuss these issues with you and learn more about them! I also would like to recommend that you take a closer look at the last movement of Op. 127 for starters because I believe that the way of thinking here is relevant to Berlioz. Here, Beethoven departs quite radically from "Classical" principles of design-tonal organization, and I can see now how this kind of freedom would have impressed Berlioz, and inspired some of his procedures. I presume that you plan to go forward with *Les Troyens*.....If so, doing so would be helpful.

By the way, I did not realize this, but Salieri wrote quite a bit for the French opera, being "anointed" for this task by Gluck. The results are impressive. *Les Danaïdes*, for example, while gruesome, is quite an opera! There are boring parts of *Tarare*, but also superb sections in a highly imaginative frame.

I will look over Wason's comments and get back to you and Dr. S.

Best, Tim

Shortly after the Twitter attack, Levi Walls posted on FB, July 27, 2020 this denunciation:

I have written the following statement in an attempt to share my experiences and shed light on the situation regarding the Journal of Schenkerian Studies. Furthermore, the purpose of this statement is to emphasize how deeply sorry I am for my involvement in the journal. Although I had no control over the content of the journal, or over the decisions regarding review processes, I am guilty of complicity because I remained in the position after I realized that my whistleblowing efforts were for naught. I hope the following account provides helpful context:

In summer 2019 (when I had just finished my first year as a PhD student in music theory at UNT) I was asked if I would like to take on a research assistantship, as assistant editor of the JSS. It would allow me to gain skills in typesetting, copyediting, and general understanding of the process that goes into an academic journal. I saw the assistantship as a good opportunity, as I am interested in research. And, naturally, as the position was under the supervision of no less than five UNT faculty members who I believed had my best academic interest at heart, it didn't seem like something I would regret. Throughout the process, myself and the editor at the time were to report directly to Timothy Jackson and Stephen Slottow, with major decisions about the journal's contents to be decided by them. As I will explain, what appeared to be a positive opportunity for a young graduate student quickly turned into an extremely shameful position that I feared I could not leave without significant damage to my career.

For the first few months, the job seemed fine, as I got to work with three articles on various topics, typesetting and offering clarity-related edits. However, after Philip Ewell's SMT presentation, Timothy Jackson decided that it was the responsibility of the journal to "protect Schenkerian analysis." Although—after serious thought—I essentially agreed with Ewell's talk, it was not up to me what did or did not go into the journal. After seeing some of the responses, I started to become incredibly worried. I gave comments to one author, including that they seemed

to devalue other fields of study, that they cherrypicked information to make Schenker appear in a better light, and that they confused cultural appropriation with egalitarianism. Shortly after, I was told by Timothy Jackson (my superior in at least three senses: a tenured faculty member who ran the journal and also served as my academic advisor) that it was not my job to censor people.

After this, things continued to go in a direction that I found to be disgusting.

I set up a secret meeting with my department chair, specifically acknowledging that I was coming to him as a whistleblower because I was worried about the potential dangers that the journal posed for the College of Music and for rational discourse in music theory. My warning was not heeded and—although I feel that he had the best of intentions—he expressed reluctance to step in and control the actions of the journal. Furthermore, after my warning that Dr. Jackson was woefully ignorant about politically correct discourse and race relations, he rebutted that “Dr. Jackson did very well in the recent diversity and inclusion workshops.”

After this, I feared that I would remain powerless and voiceless in regard to the running of the journal (despite my misleading title of “assistant editor,” and the fact that I was meant to become “editor” for volume 13). In hindsight, I should have quit the journal in protest. However, I feared retaliation from Timothy Jackson: he is an incredibly well-connected and influential figure in Schenkerian circles, and I’ve lost count of the number of people who have told me over the years that I would regret it if I ever got on his bad side. Despite this—as well as my worry about losing the financial means to support my family—I am ashamed to say that I stayed in the position. I continued to do the administrative tasks assigned to me, to typeset the articles, provide basic copyediting, and to correspond with authors about their edits via email. Eventually, I read Timothy Jackson’s response, which left me dumbfounded by its disgusting and harmful rhetoric. Even after that, I feared to do anything other than grin and bear a job that I knew was harmful to UNT, the field of music theory, people of color, and basic human decency. For that cowardice, I am truly sorry.

Sincerely,

Levi Walls

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you for the time you have all dedicated to this task and for listening in our meeting on Friday. I am writing now to follow up on a few issues raised by your questions.

The Journal of Schenkerian Studies (JSS), vol. 12, has been attacked for four main reasons: 1. assembling a Symposium of responses to Prof. Ewell without inviting him to respond in the same issue, 2. not censoring the negative responses, 3. including one anonymous response, and 4. not subjecting the responses to peer review.

As far as censorship is concerned, our purpose was to create a “safe space” in the Symposium in vol. 12 for an open and honest exchange of scholarly opinions regarding Ewell’s controversial Plenary Speech at the November 2019 Annual Meeting of the Society for Music Theory, where no such room for debate had been afforded at the 2019 Annual Meeting. I. Regarding not inviting Ewell and including the one anonymous response, there are precedents listed below. A comment posted on Facebook (anonymously!) noted, **“The principle of the ‘right to respond [in the same venue]’ that was invoked in the open letter by the Society for Music Theory (SMT) —and in the SMT board’s statement—has NOT hitherto been uniformly upheld in academic music research circles**

As I described our editorial process, the Journal was edited by an UNT student editor assisted by other students, and supported by a community of outside and inside readers; Dr. Slottow and I were always there to provide counsel and authority when it was needed, especially to deal with certain potentially problematic issues. I would also like to add about the editorial independence of the student editor that it is very necessary to make sure the scholarly community at large knows the student editor is backed up by me and Dr. Slottow. There is always a danger with junior scholars, especially a graduate student, that more senior contributors will intimidate them or ignore their criticism. Dr. Slottow and I therefore purposefully stand behind the student editor. I would hope your panel will suggest means to protect institutions like the journal and Center for Schenkerian Studies from the kind of politically motivated pressure Levi Walls was placed under as a result of accusations of “racism” from the Society of Music Theory as well as from our own faculty. The message Walls received was clearly that he had to “repent” and buckle under the pressure for censorship. Without institutional support for academic freedom, what we do as senior scholars to support the student editor is unlikely to be enough. If the message is, every time you publish something that deviates from orthodoxy you may not only be subject to a Twitter mob but the University will initiate an investigation of your work, I frankly think this will make serious scholarship untenable. In Walls case, it led to his own self flagellation and public claims to be some sort of “whistleblower.”

Our policy, generally speaking, however, was to allow student editors considerable leeway; we consulted specifically about issues concerning differences of opinion among reviewers, and also how to tone down harsh book reviews. We were always able to successfully navigate potential problems through consultation and discussion. The Symposium was the first and only time we published anything of this nature; we felt that a series of responses was justified by Ewell’s bitter attack on Schenker, Schenkerian scholars, and the methodology itself, especially since the SMT, by presenting it as a statement of policy, had prevented any criticism.

I also want to say a few additional things about the panel’s questions concerning “conflict of interest.” You asked how many times I have published in the journal, and I said that had published three articles over the past 20 years. I would like to emphasize that this is a very small portion of my scholarly output, and I include a list of my publications below. The journal is important to me, but not simply as a venue

for my work and it never has been the primary venue for my publications. It also seems to me that publication in a journal by members of the board of editors or others involved in the journal is quite common, and I have never heard that considered to be a conflict of interest.

To avoid “conflict of interest,” we involved seven scholars from UNT in drafting the call for responses so as to attract both pro- and contra-Ewell contributors (this consultation is documented in the attached PDF). Respondents trusted the process, including those who supported Professor Ewell, and both points of view were indeed published. I must say, this is much more leeway than the SMT gives me and other Schenkerians to respond to Prof. Ewell, namely none. Lesser known people (Dr. Ben Graf and Levi Walls) worked with the pro-Ewell respondents so that they did not have to deal directly with Dr. Slottow and me (given our known pro-Schenker stance); we arranged matters precisely this way so that the pro-Ewell contributors would be as comfortable as possible in expressing their views. I entered at the end of the editorial process to read and correct the proofs for all but one of the responses (I had one other scholar replace me for that task). My role, and that of other editors and colleagues in the College of Music, is fully documented by the attached files. (Re. Editorial Process - there is a longer file of 126 pages available upon the committee's request, 2. Levi Walls doc - there is a longer one of 172 pages. In my opinion, the longer documents offer no new significant new information.) My contribution was read and critiqued by all of the other editors, including my student Walls, and I adopted their suggestions.

I believe you will see that the internal deliberations of the editorial board, its working correspondence presents a record of unimpeachable behavior in the editorial process. (I might point out that the SMT journal *Spectrum* has no ethics statement and does not conform to COPE.)

The second file concerns my relationship with my former student Levi Walls (2016 to July 2020), who was employed by UNT to work on the Journal. I regard him as, in part, a victim of the attack upon me, externally by the SMT, and internally by students and faculty within the College of Music. Since he is still a student at UNT, he should be protected by FERPA regulations, although according to guidelines from the Department of Education, he forfeited his right to confidentiality by his public attack on me as a university employee and on the University through his public pronouncements including his post on Facebook. In any event, this file is self-explanatory and is submitted confidentially to the internal UNT investigation. Levi made a public recantation of his work with and for me, which, and I am not alone in this observation, recalls the spirit of show trials in totalitarian societies. The documents in the attached file contradict Walls's public accusations.

I also wanted to bring to the panel's attention some additional evidence:

1. There is precedence for assembling a symposium of responses to an author without inviting the author to respond. The responses are not - indeed cannot be - vetted in the same way as scholarly articles. Such responses can be also understood to fall under the category of “commentaries” and these are handled in a variety of ways, dependent again, on the journal. It is a “grey area” with no definitive protocol. Here are some examples, to which others could be added:

<https://www.editage.com/insights/a-young-researchers-guide-to-perspective-commentary-and-opinion-articles:>

“Commentaries draw attention to or present criticism of a previously published article, book, or report, often using the findings as a call to action or to highlight a few points of wider relevance to the field. Commentaries do not include original data and are heavily dependent on the author’s perspective or anecdotal evidence from the author’s personal experience to support the argument. Commentaries are usually very short articles, of around 1000-1500 words, and are in most cases invited by editors from reviewers or experts in the field.”

<https://www.beilstein-journals.org/bjoc/instructionsCommentary>

“Commentary articles seek to provide a critical or alternative viewpoint on a key issue or provide an insight into an important development that is of interest to a large number of scientists. These narrowly focused articles are usually commissioned by the journal.”

All the pro-Schenker responses were from established Schenkerian scholars, including authors of textbooks on Schenkerian analysis. All the pro-Ewell responses were from scholars with Ph.D.s in music theory, and all received were included. The most distinguished of the pro-Ewell responses was from the chair of the Harvard music department. All authors signed publication release forms from UNT Press.

After the SMT petition was released, one on-line critic of it noted:

- **Would the 2010 *Journal of Music Theory* (Yale) special issue on Cavell's "Music Discomposed" be deserving of censure IF the editors didn't offer Cavell an opportunity to respond in the same issue?**
- **What about when multiple articles in a special journal issue deal with the work of someone who may not necessarily identify as a "scholar"? Should Lin-Manuel Miranda have been given an opportunity to respond—in the same issue—to the 2018 *American Music* (University of Illinois Press) special issue on *Hamilton*?**
- **It is highly likely that special journal issues devoted to a single scholar's work such as the 2005–2006 *Perspectives of New Music* (Princeton) issue on Benjamin Boretz don't always employ especially rigorous peer review, if any.**
- **“*The Opera Quarterly* (Oxford University Press) is a themed journal for which content is typically solicited in advance.” Quoted from Ann Lewis, Managing Editor. It is unclear whether articles are peer reviewed or not, but they are not reviewed blind.**

2. Anonymous responses are indeed published in prestigious academic journals under these circumstances: when revealing the identity of the respondent could endanger his/her life and well-being, possibly for political reasons, **and/or ability to find and retain a job or position**. The most common anonymous responses are to political events, discussions of illegal activities, embarrassing medical conditions, difficult academic situations, and unpopular viewpoints. In the case of JSS, the anonymous scholar was a recent Ph.D. in music theory who requested anonymity to protect his chances for landing a job. The fact that viewpoints opposing the application of critical race theory to music theory are now unpopular is an understatement. The vehemence of the mob-like reaction against the Journal, against the Center for Schenkerian Studies, and against me personally speaks for itself. We have also received ample evidence that many people who signed petitions against the Journal and the

symposium authors who were critical of Professor Ewell are in fact being coerced. As you know, this entire process is a scandal that has attracted national attention, something music theory very rarely does. So I have always been puzzled by criticism that one author was permitted to publish anonymously. In retrospect, this author had more foresight than we did in requesting to do so; the anonymous author foresaw the political explosiveness of this issue when we thought we were engaging in the normal course of open scholarly debate. It is also a crowning irony that at least one of the petitions, promoted by the Society for Music Theory, circulated against me personally, the Journal, and our center is itself being promoted anonymously. Apparently, it is okay to anonymously attack the publication of an anonymous article.

The following are examples of anonymous publications in scholarly work:

- ***Journal of Management Inquiry* 24.2 (2015): 214-216.** "The case of the hypothesis that never was; Uncovering the deceptive use of post hoc hypotheses."

See the editor's note that precedes the case: "Editor's Introduction: The Provocations and Provocateurs section thrives on the idea of challenging conventional thought, action, and practice. When someone wants to publish an essay anonymously, you know that essay either has the potential to be explosive or someone is assuming anonymity to protect the semi-innocent or the demonstrably guilty. The following essay is by an author who has requested anonymity for both reasons. It concerns a practice that apparently has become increasingly common in organization study: constructing hypotheses *after* analyzing the data and then presenting those hypotheses as if they were guiding the study. Unwittingly deceiving one's self is a fascinating process; wittingly deceiving others is something else entirely. Yet, if we are to believe our anonymous author, both processes can be at play. Read the piece. This one could get you going as a commentary on how questionable practices can insinuate themselves into the fabric of our field."

- Symposium with Three Anonymous Contributions (employment issues):
***Narrative Inquiry in Bioethics*, Volume 6, Number 1, Spring 2016, pp. 3-36 (Article) Published by Johns Hopkins University Press.**

Narrative Symposium: Political Influence on Bioethical Deliberation Jean–Christophe Bélisle Pipon, Marie–Ève Lemoine, Maude Laliberté, Bryn Williams–Jones, Dan Bustillos, **Anonymous One**, **Anonymous Two**, Ashley K. Fernandes, **Anonymous Three**, Thomas D. Harter, D Micah Hester, **Anonymous Four**, Mary Faith Marshall, Philip M. Rosoff, Giles R. Scofield.

- Anonymous Article (political repercussions):
Survival Global Politics and Strategy, Anonymous (2018) "Iran Disillusioned," ***Survival*, 60:2, pp. 231-236**, DOI: 10.1080/00396338.2018.144859 **Published by Routledge**. To link to this article:
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00396338.2018.1448598>

- Two Identified Authors, One Anonymous:
***Common Knowledge*, Volume 16, Issue 2, Spring 2010, pp. 223-232** "Decorate the Dungeon": A Dialogue in Place of an Introduction. Jeffrey M. Perl, Colin Richmond, with Anonymous (Article)
Published by Duke University Press.

- Article by an Anonymous Author (employment issues):

***The American Sociologist*, Nov., 1976, Vol. 11, No. 4 (Nov., 1976), pp. 193-198** "Reflections of an Unemployed Sociologist" Author(s): Anonymous. Source: **Published by: American Sociological Association** Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27702242>

- Article by an Anonymous Author (employment issues):

***Litigation*, Winter 2015, Vol. 41, No. 2, Regrets (Winter 2015), pp. 41-45** "A Woman at Big Law: No Regrets (Off the Record)" Author(s): ANONYMOUS **Published by: American Bar Association** Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/44677753>

■ Article by an Anonymous Author (political repercussions):

***Political Geography*. Volume 62, January 2018, pp. 170-183** An interdisciplinary journal for all students of political studies with an interest in the geographical and spatial aspects of politics. The journal brings together leading contributions in the field and promotes interdisciplinary debates in international relations. "Rosewood democracy in the political forests of Madagascar."

■ Article by an Anonymous Author (political repercussions):

***Journal of Contemporary Asia* 48:3, pp. 363-394 (2018)** "Anti-Royalism in Thailand Since 2006: Ideological Shifts and Resistance," DOI: 10.1080/00472336.2018.1427021 To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2018.1427021> **Published by Routledge.**

■ Article by an Anonymous Author (problems in academe):

***International Review of Qualitative Research*, Vol. 12, No. 3, Fall 2019, pp. 215-218.** ISSN 1940-8447, eISSN 1940-8455. © 2019 International Institute for Qualitative Research, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2019.12.3.215> "Cleaning a Tarnished Bloodstained Anchor?" Anonymous

■ Article by an Anonymous Author (political repercussions)

***Feminist Review*. VOLUME: 82 ISSUE: MONTH: YEAR: 2006 PAGES: 118-119.** "Eyewitnesses to the murder of migrants at the Spanish border"

It is also my hope that the panel will make a strong statement about the need to protect academic freedom and open scholarly discourse at UNT (and in academic work beyond UNT). I think the example of the student editor, Levi Walls, and the pressure he was placed under to retract and renounce his scholarly interests, which I think you will clearly see in our correspondence, should serve as an example to what happens when faculty, graduate students, and even the administration submits to attacks on academic freedom. From the UNT statement on academic freedom:

Academic freedom and academic responsibility give vitality to the UNT and its mission. As such, the academic freedom to be able to freely consider or investigate important, and, **perhaps, controversial questions [my underline] is essential to the education of students and advancement of knowledge.**

I believe that publishing all of the responses in the Journal Symposium "by peers who are experts in the relevant subject material" - *both* pro and con - falls clearly within the responsibility of academic freedom, and "the academic freedom to be able to freely consider or investigate important, and, perhaps, **controversial** questions." I further assert that none of the responses that were published expresses support for racism or condones it. Rather, all of them disavow

racism, and some - like my own - seek an alternative way forward that will lead to genuine engagement with vital issues. We did not cherry-pick or censor the responses but published all responses from scholars with Ph.D.s in music theory, with some editing of course, and an amalgamation of the scholarly apparatus in a unified bibliography.

To support my statements about “conflict of interest” above, I am listing my publications here to show that the three articles that I have published in JSS are but a small percentage of my total output: I have bolded the three articles I published in JSS.

Books and Monographs:

Bruckner Studies, eds. Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). (refereed)

Cambridge Handbook on Tchaikovsky's Sixth Symphony (Pathétique) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). (refereed)

Perspectives on Anton Bruckner, eds. Timothy L. Jackson, Paul Hawkshaw (Yale), and Crawford Howie (Manchester), (London: Ashgate Press, 2001). (refereed)

Sibelius Studies, eds. Timothy L. Jackson and Veijo Murtomäki (Sibelius Academy), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). (refereed)

Sibelius in the Old and New World: Aspects of His Music, Its Interpretation, and Reception, eds. Timothy L. Jackson and Veijo Murtomäki (Peter Lang: New York, Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, Oxford, Wien, 2010).

“The Schenker-Opel Exchange: Schenker as Composition Teacher,” *Music Analysis* 20/1 (2001) (Oxford), pp. 1-116. (refereed)

Article on “Bruckner” in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* ed. S. Sadie and J. Tyrrell (London: Macmillan, 2001) and Grove On-line (Oxford University Press, 2004).

Published Articles:

“Richard Strauss’s *Winterweihe* — An Analysis and Study of the Sketches.” *Richard Strauss-Blätter* XVII (1987), pp. 28-69.

“Compositional Revisions in Richard Strauss’s *Waldseligkeit* and a New Source.” *Richard Strauss-Blätter* XXI (1989), pp. 55-84.

“Mozart’s *Little Gigue* in G major — A Study in Rhythmic Shift, A Reminiscence of the Competition with Haessler?” *Mitteilungen der internationalen Mozart-Gesellschaft* XXXVII (1989), pp. 70-80.

Comment on Steven Parkany's "Kurth's Bruckner and the Adagio of the Seventh Symphony." *Nineteenth Century Music* XIII/1 (1989), pp. 74-75.

"The Enharmonics of Faith: Enharmonic Symbolism in Bruckner's *Christus factus est* (1884)." *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1987-88*, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Linz, 1990, pp. 4-20.

"Schubert as John the Baptist to Wagner-Jesus' — Large-scale Enharmonicism in Bruckner and his Models," in *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1991-93*, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Linz, 1995, pp. 61-108.

"Gabriel Fauré's Expansions of Non-Duple Hypermeter in *La Fleur qui va sur l'eau* Op. 85, No. 2." *In Theory Only* XII (November 1991), pp. 1-24.

"Schoenberg's Op. 14 Songs: Textual Sources and Analytical Perception," *Theory and Practice* XIV (1989/90 double issue), pp. 35-58.

"Bruckner's Metrical Numbers," *Nineteenth Century Music* XIV/2 (Fall 1990), pp. 101-31.

"Schubert's Revisions of *Der Jüngling und der Tod* D 545a-b and *Meeres Stille* D 216a-b," *The Musical Quarterly* LXXV/3 (1991), pp. 335-60 (American Oxford).

"The Metamorphosis of Richard Strauss's *Metamorphosen* — New Analytical and Source Critical Discoveries," in *Richard Strauss: His Life and Work*, ed. Bryan Gilliam, Duke University Press, 1992, pp. 193-241.

"Current Issues in Schenkerian Analysis." Feature review-article on *Trends in Schenkerian Research*, ed. Allen Cadwallader (Schirmer Books, 1990) and *Schenker Studies*, 1990, ed. Hedi Siegel (Cambridge University Press) for *The Musical Quarterly* LXXVI/2 (1992), pp. 242-63 (American Oxford).

"*Ruhe, meine Seele!* and the *Letzte Orchesterlieder*," in *Richard Strauss and His World*, ed. Bryan Gilliam, Princeton University Press (1992), pp. 90-138. Translated as "*Ruhe, meine Seele!* und die *Letzten Orchesterlieder*" in *Richard Strauss-Blätter* XXI (1995), pp. 84-128.

Review of *Arnold Schoenberg, the Composer as Jew* by Alexander Ringer, *Theory and Practice* 18 (1993), pp. 171-78.

"Bruckner's Rhythm: Syncopated Hyperrhythm and Diachronic Transformation in the Second Symphony," in *Anton Bruckner — Persönlichkeit und Werk*, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Linz, 1995, pp. 93-106.

"Hearing Schoenberg," review-article on Silvina Milstein, *Arnold Schoenberg. Notes Sets Forms*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, for the *Journal of Musicological Research* 15/4 (1995) pp. 285-311 (Gordon Breach, UK).

"Aspects of Sexuality and Structure in the Later Symphonies of Tchaikovsky," *Music Analysis* 14/1 (1995), pp. 3-25 (British Oxford).

"The Tragic Reversed Recapitulation in the German Classical Tradition," *Journal of Music Theory* 40.1 (1996), pp. 23-72 (Yale University Press).

"The Finale of Bruckner's Seventh Symphony and Tragic Reversed Sonata Form," in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, eds. Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw, Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 140-208.

"'Your Songs Proclaim God's Return' — Arnold Schoenberg, the Composer and His Jewish Faith," *International Journal of Musicology* VI (1997), pp. 277-315.

"Bruckner's *Oktaven*," *Music and Letters* 86 (1997), pp. 391-409 (British Oxford University Press). Expanded version published as: "*Bruckner's Oktaven*: the problem of consecutives, doubling, and orchestral voice-leading." *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, eds. Timothy L. Jackson, Paul Hawkshaw, and Crawford Howie, (London: Ashgate Press, 2001).

"Dmitri Shostakovich, the Composer as Jew," in *Shostakovich Reconsidered*, eds. Dmitri Feofanov and Allan Ho, (New York, London, Paris: Toccata Press, 1998), pp.597-642.

"'A Heart of Ice: Crystallization in Sibelius's *Pohjola's Daughter* and Other Works." Conference Report of the Second International Sibelius Conference in Helsinki, November 1995, ed. Eero Taarasti, 1998, pp. 100-123.

"Diachronic Transformation in a Schenkerian Context. A Study of the Brahms Haydn Variations Op. 56a-b," in *Schenker Studies* 2, eds. Hedi Siegel and Carl Schachter, Cambridge University Press (1999), pp. 195-237.

"Brahms's 9 *Lieder und Gesaenge*, Opus 63," in *The Compleat Brahms. A Guide to the Musical Works of Johannes Brahms*," ed. Leon Botstein (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999), pp. 251-254.

"Diachronische Transformation im Schenkerschen Kontext: Brahms' Haydn-Variationen," in *Johannes Brahms. Quellen – Text – Rezeption – Interpretation. Internationaler Brahms-Kongress Hamburg 1997*, eds. Friedhelm Krummacher and Michael Struck (Munich: Henle Verlag, 1999), pp. 453-92.

"The *Adagio* of Bruckner's Sixth Symphony: The Anticipatory Tonic Recapitulation in Bruckner, Brahms, and Dvorak." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, eds. Timothy L. Jackson, Paul Hawkshaw, and Crawford Howie, (London: Ashgate Press, 2001).

"Die Wagnersche Umarmungs-Metapher bei Bruckner und Mahler" ("The Wagnerian 'Embrace' Metaphor in Bruckner and Mahler,"), in *Bruckner-Probleme, Beiheft zum Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, ed. Albrecht Riethmüller (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999), pp. 134-52.

"Observations on crystallization and entropy in the music of Sibelius and other composers," in *Sibelius Studies*, eds. Timothy L. Jackson and Veijo Murtomaki (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 175-275.

"A Contribution to the Musical Poetics of Dmitri Shostakovich: Observations on 'Putting the Jew back in Christ,'" in *Dmitri Schostakowitsch und das juedische musikalische Erbe*, eds. Ernst Kuhn, Andreas Wehrmeyer und Guenter Wolter (Berlin: Verlag Ernst Kuhn, 2001), pp. 19-55.

"Brucknerian Models: Sonata Form and Linked Internal Auxiliary Cadences," Sibelius Forum II. Proceedings from the Third International Jean Sibelius Conference, Helsinki December 7-10, 2000, Sibelius Academy, 2003, pp. 155-171.

"The Problem of the Second Group in the First Movement of Tubin's Fifth Symphony: A Schenkerian View," *Yearbook of the International Eduard Tubin Society*. Vol. 3 (2003). International Eduard Tubin Society: Tallinn, 2003. ISSN 146-7077, pp. 59-69.

Translation of Schenker's article on Mozart's A minor Sonata in *Der Tonwille*, ed. William Drabkin (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 55-71.

"[Paul Kletzki and Reinhard Oppel: two forgotten composers](http://www.jmi.org.uk/suppressedmusic/publications/ifsmnews6.html)," *JMI International Forum for Suppressed Music Newsletter No. 6*, January 2004.
<http://www.jmi.org.uk/suppressedmusic/publications/ifsmnews6.html>

CD Program booklet for BIS CD 1399, Paul Kletzki, Third Symphony "In Memoriam," Concertino for Flute, 2004.

"*Schliesse mir die Augen beide*: an Analysis of Six Settings by Berg, Oppel, Tintner, Zilcher, and Kletzki," *A Composition as a Problem*. Vol. IV. *Scripta Musicalia*: Tallinn (2004), pp. 51-88.

"Representations of "Exile" and "Consolation" in Hindemith's *Mathis der Maler*," *A Composition as a Problem*. Vol. IV. *Scripta Musicalia*: Tallinn (2004), pp. 17-44.

"The Finale of Tubin's Fifth Symphony from a Schenkerian Perspective." *Proceedings of the International Conference "Eduard Tubin 100."* (Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre, 2007).

"The *Umlinie* in Hindemith's String Quartet Op. 22, Second Movement?" in *A Composition as a Problem*, *A Composition as a Problem*. Vol. V. *Scripta Musicalia*: Tallinn (2008), pp. 146-174.

"Eine Annäherung an Paul Kletzki." *Musica Reanimata* Nr. 58 (2006), pp. 6-17.

"*Hinauf strebt's* : Song Study with Carl Schachter" in *Structure and Meaning in Tonal Music: Festschrift in honor of Carl Schachter*, eds. Poundie Burstein and David Gagné, (Hillsdale, NY ; Pendragon Press, Year: 2006), pp. 191-202.

"Sibelius the Political" in *Sibelius in the Old and New World: Aspects of His Music, Its Interpretaton, and Reception*, eds. Timothy L. Jackson and Veijo Murtomäki (Peter Lang: New York, Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, Oxford, Wien, 2010, pp. 69-124.

"The *Umlinie* in Hindemith's String Quartet Op. 22 Second Movement?" in *A Composition as a Problem V*, (Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre, 2008), pp. 146-86.

"Escaping from a Black Hole: Facing Depression in Academia," read at the National Joint Conference of the American Musicological Society and the Society for Music Theory, Nashville, 7 November, 2008, published in *Music Theory Online (MTO)* Volume 15, Numbers 3 and 4, August 2009.

"Punctus contra punctam: Hans Weisse's Counterpoint Studies with Heinrich Schenker," read at the National Joint Conference of the American Musicological Society and the Society for Music Theory, Nashville, 7 November, 2008, *The Journal of Schenkerian Studies IV* (2010), pp. 87-186.

"Thierfelder's 1935 Open Letter to Sibelius and Adorno's Critique – Some Preliminary Observations," *Säteitä* (Sibelius Academy Yearbook, 2010), pp. 10-42.

"Heinrich Schenker's Comments on Some Compositions by Reinhard Oppel," *A Composition as A Problem VI* (2012), pp. 5-95.

Obituary/eulogy for Prof. Edward Laufer, "*Musae Iovis plangite!*" in the *Society for Music Theory Newsletter* (Volume 37/2), pp. 20-21.

Program book essay for the special Festival Concert for the 150th Birthday Celebration of Richard Strauss in the National Theater of the Bavarian State Opera [Bayerische Staatsoper, Munich], June 10, 2014.

Program book essay for the Production of Richard Strauss's *Ariadne* at the National Theater for the Bavarian State Opera, June 15, 2015. *Anmerkungen zur Oper Arabella: Aspekte biografischer Verstrickungen* [Observations on the Opera Arabella: Aspects of the Biographical Omissions] in the Program Book for the performance of Richard Strauss's *Arabella* in the National Theater of the Bavarian State Opera, Munich, July 2015.

"The 'Pseudo-Einsatz' in Two Handel Fugues: Heinrich Schenker's Analytical Work with Reinhard Oppel" in *Bach to Brahms. Essays in Musical Design and Structure*, edited by David Beach and Yosef Goldenberg (Rochester and London: Rochester University Press, 2015), pp. 173-203.

"The First Movements of Anton Eberl's Symphonies in E flat major and D minor, and Beethoven's *Eroica*:" Towards "New" Sonata Forms?" in *Explorations in Schenkerian Analysis*, eds. Su Yin Mak and David Beach (Rochester and London: Rochester University Press, 2016), pp. 61-98.

"Elucidations of Post-Tonal Free Composition," *Journal of Schenkerian Studies X* (2017), pp. 23-177. Edward Laufer Festschrift.

"The Company You Keep:' Recipients of the Honorary Doctorates from the 1936 Heidelberg Celebration – Sibelius and Those Honored with Him," in *Jean Sibelius's Legacy*, edited by Daniel Grimley (Professor of Music, Merton College, Oxford) and Veijo Murtomäki (Professor, Sibelius Academy) (Cambridge: Scholars Press, Cambridge, UK, 2017), pp. 88-110.

"'Punctuation Form' and Expressive Contents in the First Main Period of Selected G Minor Symphonies's First Movements of the Classical Era—Kochian-Schenkerian Approaches," with Veijo Murtomäki (Sibelius Academy), *Journal of Schenkerian Studies XI* (2018), pp. 2-59. Edward Laufer Festschrift.

"Berg's Linear Counterpoint," under review.

“The Punctuation Forms of Mozart’s Symphonies in G minor,” under review. Co-authored with Veijo Murtomäki (Sibelius Academy).

“Sibelius and the SS,” under review.

Please note that I interpreted the mandate of the investigating committee rather more narrowly, based on Provost Crowley’s letter to me of September 7, 2020, in which she states that the focus is on Volume 12:

The university is investigating neither you nor the Journal of Schenkerian Studies. I think it is fair to presume that we agree the journal is a UNT publication, since it is housed in the Center for Schenkerian Studies and is funded by the university. As such, the university has an interest in the complaints about the circumstances surrounding Volume 12 that have come from all corners, and ensuring the journal meets the standards of a peer reviewed, academic publication. The university has the discretion, if not the obligation, to look into these circumstances. A panel of faculty with experience editing peer-reviewed journals has been appointed to do just that; not to investigate you or the journal, or to look into whether a particular policy has been violated. Hopefully, this clarification puts an end to the misinformation and mischaracterization about this matter.

My purpose in founding the Journal was to bring prestige and a reputation for excellence in the field of Schenkerian Studies to the University of North Texas. I should note that while initially Volume 12 was greeted with complaints, it has increasingly also been widely praised for its critique of Ewell. Now this controversy has become international, with primarily European scholars opposed to the SMT and UNT petitions expressing their views, for example, here: <https://heinrichschenker.wordpress.com/open-letter-on-schenkers-racism-and-its-reception-in-the-united-states/>

At the present time, articles critical of Ewell, the SMT, and unfortunately also UNT, are increasingly appearing in important *both* liberal and conservative venues across the globe. The fact that outside observers writing in both left- and right-wing news organizations can agree on anything in the current polarized climate, and especially in their criticism of Ewell and his followers, seems highly significant. Consider, for example, that the largest Israeli newspaper *HaAretz*, which is left-of-center and the equivalent to *The New York Times*, published an article here: <https://www.haaretz.com/us-news/.premium-wagner-in-yiddish-the-jewish-composer-roiling-a-texas-campus-1.9127237?v=1599309166077> critical of Ewell and the SMT. I understand that *The New York Times* has conducted its own in-depth investigation and will be publishing a report in the coming week or so. Other more conservative voices are also being raised: <https://www.nationalreview.com/2020/07/at-the-university-of-north-texas-the-mob-comes-calling-for-a-music-theorist/>

I also attach a more philosophical critique of Ewell by Prof. Bruno Chaouat of the University of Minnesota. Therefore, while the initial response on Twitter and Facebook, and the hastily assembled condemnations supported Ewell, a slower but ultimately more significant counter movement is beginning to emerge among musicians and non-musicians world-wide.

I sincerely hope that the international good will that both the Journal and the Center have generated and fostered over the years will continue to grow, and I am motivated to quickly move forward in a

positive direction. I believe that I have answered all the committee's questions clearly and in a forthright manner. Thank-you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Timothy L. Jackson
Distinguished University Research Professor of Music Theory
Professor of Music Theory
College of Music
University of North Texas
Denton, TX 76203

[EXT] Fwd: Response to Ewell?

Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]

Wed 12/11/2019 5:40 PM

To: Stephen Slottow [REDACTED]; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Lavacek, Justin <Justin.Lavacek@unt.edu>

Dear Colleagues,

I have approached a number of Schenkerians directly with request for comment on Ewell's SMT presentation. We will receive publishable replies from at least four outside distinguished scholars. Not from Eric Wen, however, see below.

We need to decide about issuing the general call for responses.

Best, Tim

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Eric Wen** <ewen@juilliard.edu>

Date: Tue, Dec 10, 2019 at 10:09 PM

Subject: Re: Response to Ewell?

To: Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]

Thanks for sending this, Tim.

Aristotle believed in slavery, do we throw him out the window, too?

I watched the video, and simply cannot waste my time responding to such a simplistic view of Schenker. If we denigrate the work of important artists and scholars based on their personal and idiosyncratic views, we might as well completely dismantle most of civilization's achievements.

Today's obsession with political correctness has simply obscured any real judgement.

At my age I'm ready to be put out to pasture...

All best,
Eric

From: Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]**Sent:** Saturday, December 7, 2019 6:57 PM**To:** Eric Wen <ewen@juilliard.edu>**Subject:** Response to Ewell?**External Mail**

Timothy L. Jackson
Distinguished Research Professor of Music Theory
Professor of Music Theory
College of Music
University of North Texas
Denton, TX 76203 USA

**UNT_000563**

Dear Eric,

I am taking the liberty of contacting you with regard to a call for responses by the *Journal for Schenkerian Studies* to Phillip Ewell's lecture at the Plenary Session of the Society for Music Theory this past November. His Power Point Slides and a video of his lecture are available at PowerPoint slides: <http://philipewell.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/SMT-Plenary-Slides.pdf>

Video recording: <https://vimeo.com/372726003>

In order to expedite the call for responses, Ewell's remarks on Schenker are transcribed, and the content of the relevant slides is reproduced below.

As an Asian American, and as the author of the (in my view, best) textbook on Schenkerian analysis, I would consider a reply from you to be especially important. If you wish, you can watch the video of the talk in its entirety at the link above. I have transcribed just Ewell's remarks about Schenker, who serves as his example of racism in music theory. He contends that not only was Schenker himself a virulent racist, but that his analytical approach is inherently racist.

Ewell's comments about Schenker, as his core example of racism in music theory, begin with, "The best example through which to examine our white frame is through Heinrich Schenker, a fervent racist, whose racism *undoubtedly* influenced his music theory, yet it gets whitewashed for general consumption. It would be hard to overestimate Schenker's influence on American music theory.....Schenker represents our shared model of what it means to be a music theorist. In his voluminous writings, Schenker often mentions white and black as modifiers for human races." Ewell then reads the quotes from Schenker's diary and letters taken from Schenker Documents Online in the slide, "Schenker's Racism." Then comes the slide "Schenker's Anti-Black Racism." "Schenker disparages the music of blacks, especially Negro spirituals claiming that they were completely falsified dishonest misappropriation of European music. It seems Schenker liked these spirituals, since he compared them to European music. But instead of according blacks a measure of artistic integrity, he reduces the genre to thievery, stripping it of its humanity, which in turn reflects his hatred of blackness....." [Then Ewell reveals Schenker's hatred of the black male body, and his views against racial mixing.] "This is paramount because white racial frame authors on the rare occasion that they deal with this topic have generally called Schenker's racism cultural and not biological." [Thereby, as per the next slide, the white frame seeks to shield Schenker from unwanted criticism.] "Schenker's racism presented a problem for those who promoted his work. To solve this problem, his offensive writings were either removed or whitewashed for general consumption." [The next slide is about the "white racial frame that whitewashes people like Schenker."] "This is precisely what has happened with Schenker in our white racial frame."

Then comes (at 13:12) a very important slide, entitled "Whitewashing Schenker, I," which quotes Jonas, Oster, Forte, Rothstein, Benjamin, and Cook; Ewell now asserts that all of the above-named Schenkerian scholars "whitewashed" Schenker because they claimed that his music theory can be separated from his political and other views, and also, very importantly, that these scholars removed offensive, *racist* passages from *Free Composition* (might we note that this is a direct attack especially on Oster and Forte, who translated and edited *Free Composition*). "On this slide I have listed six clear instances in which our white frame has shoved aside, ignored, or treated as incidental, Schenker's racism, that it has no bearing on his music theories, that it can be disregarded, or omitted; that his supposed indiscretions were just peripheral ramblings." William Benjamin implies, "not only was Schenker not racist, he was actually a closet egalitarian." "The only thing left off the table is simply calling Schenker the virulent racist he was." In the slide labeled "Whitewashing Schenker, II," (14: 20) "John Rothgeb is saying that not only was Schenker himself incorrect, when he expressed that his racist speculations were key to his musical precepts, Rothgeb is actually implying that it would be inappropriate or unfair to examine race in Schenker's theories. Finally, in an eighth example of whitewashing Schenker, among countless others,

UNT_000564

Nicholas Cook says that it would be unhelpful to make the obvious parallel between Schenker's theories on music and his theories on race. What Cook means to say here is that it would be unhelpful to music theory's white racial frame insofar as it would call attention to race and whiteness."

"I wish to recouple this severed link between Schenker's beliefs about music and his beliefs about people. Ironically the person who would most agree with this recoupling is Heinrich Schenker himself, who often spoke of how his unified world view should be considered a whole. Ultimately, our white racial frame's removal and denial of race in the study of Schenker and his musical theories is a textbook example of colorblind racism. When reading Schenker's musical theoretical works anew from a critical race perspective, it is actually quite easy to see his racism in his music theories. As with the inequality of races, Schenker believed in the inequality of tones." [Ewell then presents his slide, Two Schenker Quotes, One on the Inequality of Peoples, the Other on the Inequality of Tones.] Here we begin to see how Schenker's racism pervaded his music theories. In short, neither racial classes, nor pitch classes, were equal in Schenker's theories. He uses the same language to express these beliefs. Since he wrote this in 1922, when virtually all of Africa was under white colonial rule, his sentiment is clear: blacks must be controlled by whites. Similarly, Schenker believed notes from the fundamental structure must control other notes, as the quote on the right of the slide shows. I have only scratched the surface showing how Schenker's racism permeates his music theories."

Here is the text of the slides, which we don't need to reproduce, but which coordinate with the main text:

Schenker's Racism [SDO = Schenker Documents Online]

- He speaks of "Less able or more primitive races" (2015, online "Literature" supplement, 21), "inferior races" ([1910 and 1922] 2001, vol. 1, 28), and "wild and half wild peoples" (Diary entry, September 8, 1914, SDO).
- He speaks of whiteness in relation to the "animal" Japanese, that the "white race" will need to adapt in order to "annihilate" the Japanese "animals" (Diary entry, August 20, 1914, SDO).
- Writing about the "Slavic half-breed": "There will be no peace on earth until...the German race crushes the Slavs on the grounds of superiority" (Diary entry, July 26, 1914, SDO).
- "'Race' is good, 'inbreeding' of race, however, is murky" (Handwritten letter, January 13, 1934, SDO). • He expressed horror at the mixing of races in "Senegalese marriage relationships" ([1921– 1923] 2004, vol. 1, 5) and "intermarrying black racial stock with...a French mother" ([1921– 1923] 2004, 18).

Whitewashing Schenker

1. Oswald Jonas omitted several passages of *Der freie Satz* "that have no bearing on the musical content of the work" (Schenker [1935] 1979, xiii).
2. Ernst Oster: "I felt it best to omit several additional passages of a very general, sometimes semi-philosophical nature here; these omissions are not expressly indicated" (Schenker [1935] 1979, xiii).
3. Allen Forte: "Almost none of the material bears substantive relation to the musical concepts that [Schenker] developed during his lifetime and, from that standpoint, can be disregarded" (Schenker [1935] 1979, xviii).

4. William Rothstein reduces Schenker's offensive language to "supposed indiscretions" and "peripheral ramblings" (Rothstein, 8).
5. William Benjamin: "[Schenker's] apparent racism was an emotional reflex which stood in contradiction to his personal belief system" (Benjamin, 157).
6. Nicholas Cook offers "humor," [i.e., Schenker was joking] as a possible reason for Schenker's disgusting language (Cook, 148).
7. John Rothgeb: "We urge the reader to recognize that however much Schenker may have regarded his musical precepts as an integral part of a unified worldview, they are, in fact, not at all logically dependent on any of his extra-musical speculations. Indeed, no broader philosophical context is necessary—or even relevant—to their understanding" (Schenker [1910 and 1922] 2001, xiv).
8. Nicholas Cook comments on Schenker's "authoritarian impulse that is expressed in the many hierarchies which make up Schenker's worldview (it is tempting but I think not very helpful to draw the obvious parallel with his music theory)" (153).

Two Schenker quotes, one on the inequality of peoples, the other on the inequality of notes

"But let the German mind also gather the courage to report: it is not true that all men are equal, since it is, rather, out of the question that the incapable ever become able; that which applies to individuals surely must apply to nations and peoples as well" (2015, online "Literature" supplement, 23n13).

"It is therefore a contradiction to maintain, for example, that all scale tones between 'C' and 'c' have real independence or, to use a current but certainly musically unsuitable expression, 'equal rights'" ([1935] 1979, 13n3).

Two Schenker quotes, one on whites controlling blacks, the other on the fundamental structure controlling the middleground and foreground

About whites controlling blacks he says, "Even negroes proclaim that they want to govern themselves because they, too, can achieve it" (Handwritten letter, September 25, 1922, SDO). [That is, blacks must be controlled by whites.]

About the scale degrees of the fundamental structure, he says, "the scale-degrees of the fundamental structure have decisive control over the middleground and foreground" ([1935] 1979, 111).

Looking forward to hearing from you,

With best wishes,

Tim

From: [Slottow, Stephen](#)
To: [Timothy Jackson](#); [Walls, Levi](#)
Cc: [Bakulina, Ellen](#); [Chung, Andrew](#); [Graf, Benjamin](#); [Cubero, Diego](#)
Subject: Re: [EXT] Re: JSS
Date: Saturday, July 25, 2020 10:28:13 PM

Dear All,

Ellen called me. I am not on twitter and, although I am on FB, none of my FB friends seem involved with this, so until Ellen contacted me I knew nothing about it and still have seen nothing.

Here's how I see it: Ewell gave a talk at SMT, to which there was no opportunity to respond. The JSS initiative was for the purpose of giving Schenkerians an opportunity to respond to Ewell's comments, since they had no opportunity at SMT. The responses were to the SMT comments; at that point Ewell's fuller treatment in MTO had not been published. Ewell was not invited to respond to the JSS articles--the feeling was that he had already had his say, now some Schenkerians could have theirs. The grad student report was left anonymous at the author's request. I do not have the details of the deadlines given for submissions--Levi would know those.

As for a response--at the moment, I haven't seen anything to respond to. Certainly Levi's reputation should be protected and it would be good to make the JSS issue more widely available. A statement to--whom? where?--may be in order.

-sps

From: Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 9:47 PM
To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Cc: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: [EXT] Re: JSS

Dear Colleagues,

I think that whether the *Journal* wants to publish responses to the responses is something that we on the editorial team will need to discuss. My feeling is that we should consider such "second level" responses as long as they are factual and focused, and have scholarly merit. As I said, *MTO* asked that we consider publishing more responses to Ewell's article.d

However, to be clear, the buck stops with me and Stephen Slottow. So, if anyone wants to "blame" anyone, they can and should address me and Stephen rather than Levi.

Andrew: perhaps if you feel it necessary, you can inform people that they can write to me using email. Unlike our current president, I do not use Twitter. But if they want to send me an email, you can give them my unt email address. That will be the official response for now.

Perhaps we could consider releasing the "Symposium" early, but this - again - is something we would need to consult about.

Best, Tim

On Sat, Jul 25, 2020 at 8:55 PM Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu> wrote:

Hi all,

I just heard about this. It's very worrying, especially as I don't want my career to be ruined before it properly began. I have a family to take care of now. I'm also confused about what exactly people want. The responses were to Ewell's paper. Did Ewell want to respond to his own paper? If he wants to respond to the responses to his paper, then that is perfectly reasonable, and I don't think anyone would have a problem with that. We could publish something in the upcoming volume, if that is what people want. But he couldn't have responded to responses that hadn't yet come out. Since the journal printed every response that we got, it should go without saying that we weren't interested in presenting a one-sided picture. Quite the opposite. We emphasized in the CFP that we wanted a wide range of views.

At the moment, people seem to be speculating about the journal without actually reading it. Maybe we should consider releasing it online early, so that misinformation does not spread.

I really hope all this can be resolved somehow.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>

Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 6:37 PM

To: Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>

Cc: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>

Subject: Re: JSS

Dear Tim, Stephen, Levi, CC Andrew, Ben, Diego,

Please see below a message from Andrew Chung about a serious situation that has come up

UNT_000301

in connection with the latest issue of JSS. I completely agree with Andrew that the social media response is getting serious and should be somehow addressed. I don't have a Twitter account, but I am on Facebook and I am currently following (and taking a modest part in) a discussion there.

All best,
-Ellen

From: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: RE: JSS

Dear Ellen and colleagues,

Yes, please feel free to forward this message to anyone you think would be appropriate.

Best,
Andrew

From: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 8:31 PM
To: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: JSS

Hi Andrew and all,

Thanks so much for alerting us. I see something similar on Facebook. Do I have your permission to forward this message to Tim Jackson, Stephen Slottow, and Levi Walls (the current editor)? They should be informed and involved.

Thanks,
-Ellen

From: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 7:08 PM
To: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Subject: JSS

Dear colleagues,

I apologize for interrupting your weekends, but via twitter, I have been seeing that there has been some early and vociferous pushback re: the new issue of JSS, with concerns that Phillip Ewell wasn't invited to respond and that there is an anonymous contribution (are these still true? The last information I became privy to about the issue was in March). I

imagine this is something JSS would want to address carefully especially in light of the past three months or so if this isn't already on the radar of everyone involved in JSS, since, from the looks of the social media attention it is possible that the situation could get serious.

Respectfully,
Andrew

Dear Diego, Colleagues,

It turns out that the Symposium is now already available as a Google doc on line.

Diego, to reply directly to your query: Stephen, Ben, Levi, and I read through and edited every word of the responses very carefully. I want to stress that these responses were not articles to be sent out for blind review. Rather, they were responses to Ewell's "Plenary Session" critique of Schenker, Schenkerians, and Schenkerian theory by identified authors (with one exception, already explained). The intention of the Symposium, as explained in the call, was to allow scholars to express their views freely and honestly, and without ideological censorship, as long as they remained focused on the relevant issues. As I understand it, all were contributed by university professors, holders of earned doctorates in music theory, and sometimes authors of books and textbooks. We also combined all of the scholarly apparatus into a single bibliography.

The responses, which, if you read them, were pretty well evenly split between pro- and contra-, and published in the Symposium back-to-back in alternation so as to present a balanced picture of the results of the call for comments. The majority of the authors are well-known, highly seasoned scholars, ranging from the Chair of the Harvard Music Department to the authors of books on Schenker and Schenkerian analysis. If you want to use the word "vetting" in this context of allowing distinguished scholars to communicate their views, then you can say that the respondents were "vetted" on the basis of their academic qualifications. The distinguished pedigrees of the contributors is supported by their short biographies at the end of the issue.

All the best,

Tim

On Sun, Jul 26, 2020 at 12:52 PM Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu> wrote:
I, too, want to know who vetted the responses before publication?

From: "Heidlberger, Frank" <Frank.Heidlberger@unt.edu>

Date: Sunday, July 26, 2020 at 12:25 PM

To: "Slottow, Stephen" <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>, "Brand, Benjamin" <Benjamin.Brand@unt.edu>, Diego Cubero <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>, "Graf, Benjamin" <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>, "Chung, Andrew" <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>, "Walls, Levi" <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>, "Bakulina, Ellen" <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>, Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: JSS

Ok, thanks for all the information, particularly the twitter conversation. On Facebook, Chris Segall's last post and the ensuing comments are insightful (and concerning). Still: I NEED TO READ THE ARTICLES, particularly this ominous "anonymous" one.

Can somebody please send me a pdf version of the issue RIGHT NOW!

And, who vetted the responses before publication?

I agree with all colleagues stating that this is a serious issue.
Frank

Dr. Frank Heidlberger
Professor of Music Theory
Music Theory Area Coordinator
University of North Texas
College of Music
1155, Union Circle # 311367
Denton, TX 76203
U.S.A.
Phone: (940) 369-7542
Fax (940) 565-2002

From: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2020 12:16 PM
To: Brand, Benjamin <Benjamin.Brand@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]; Heidlberger, Frank <Frank.Heidlberger@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: JSS

Please disregard my earlier email--I found a way to sufficiently expand the responses.

-sps

From: Brand, Benjamin <Benjamin.Brand@unt.edu>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2020 10:17 AM
To: Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Heidlberger, Frank <Frank.Heidlberger@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: JSS

Dear Colleagues,

In light of recent developments, I would like to call an emergency meeting for this afternoon at 4:00pm (central time). I apologize for taking your time on a weekend, but this simply can't wait until Monday. The Zoom meeting ID is: 939 5729 3080. I will send you a calendar invite as well. Please do your utmost to attend.

Sincerely,
Benjamin

Benjamin Brand, Ph.D.
Pronouns: he, him, his | Professor of Music History



From: "Cubero, Diego" <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>

Date: Sunday, July 26, 2020 at 8:52 AM

To: Benjamin Graf <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>, Andrew Chung <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>, "Walls, Levi" <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>, Ellen Bakulina <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>, Timothy Jackson [REDACTED], Stephen Slottow <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>, "Brand, Benjamin" <Benjamin.Brand@unt.edu>

Subject: Re: JSS

Good morning, colleagues:

I agree that this is a serious situation. I am neither on Twitter nor Facebook, but I can say that the issues has grabbed the attention of the Society for Music Theory's Committee on Diversity. While the situation most immediately involves the Journal's editorial staff and the authors of some of the essays, I think it also affects the reputation of our program as a whole. I have copied Benjamin Brand to make him aware of this situation.

Diego

From: "Graf, Benjamin" <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>

Date: Saturday, July 25, 2020 at 9:47 PM

To: "Chung, Andrew" <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>, "Walls, Levi" <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>, "Bakulina, Ellen" <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>, Timothy Jackson [REDACTED], "Slottow, Stephen" <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>

Cc: Diego Cubero <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>

Subject: Re: JSS

Yes, we need to respond!! This is getting out of hand quickly.

I think we should send Ewell a copy and invite him to respond.

There are some misconceptions floating around that need to be addressed.

For example, I was under the impression that we were going to have a discussion with Ewell about his racial studies work. I was looking forward to it!

A lot of those commenting have not read the issue, it could help to release it.

I only have my cell with me, so apologize for the brevity and lack of formality.

Best,

Ben

Benjamin Graf, Ph.D.

University of North Texas

Music History, Theory and Ethnomusicology

Office: MU215

From: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 9:12:37 PM
To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Cc: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: RE: JSS

Dear all,

I agree with Levi that a well-considered and timely response seems important. From what I have been seeing, people on social media are not happy that there is not a published response-to-the-responses written by Ewell at the invitation of JSS, and have concerns that the journal published an anonymous article whatever the merits and complexities for doing so. I think it would be wise to address this carefully and promptly because I wouldn't want to see a negative consequence from this for Levi based on hasty assumptions from the social media-verse.

Best,
Andrew

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 8:56 PM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Cc: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: JSS

Hi all,

I just heard about this. It's very worrying, especially as I don't want my career to be ruined before it properly began. I have a family to take care of now. I'm also confused about what exactly people want. The responses were to Ewell's paper. Did Ewell want to respond to his own paper? If he wants to respond to the responses to his paper, then that is perfectly reasonable, and I don't think anyone would have a problem with that. We could publish something in the upcoming volume, if that is what people want. But he couldn't have responded to responses that hadn't yet come out. Since the journal printed every response that we got, it should go without saying that we weren't interested in presenting a one-sided picture. Quite the opposite. We emphasized in the CFP that we wanted a wide range of views.

At the moment, people seem to be speculating about the journal without actually reading it. Maybe we should consider releasing it online early, so that misinformation does not spread.

UNT_000307

I really hope all this can be resolved somehow.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 6:37 PM
To: Timothy Jackson [REDACTED]; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Cc: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: JSS

Dear Tim, Stephen, Levi, CC Andrew, Ben, Diego,

Please see below a message from Andrew Chung about a serious situation that has come up in connection with the latest issue of JSS. I completely agree with Andrew that the social media response is getting serious and should be somehow addressed. I don't have a Twitter account, but I am on Facebook and I am currently following (and taking a modest part in) a discussion there.

All best,
-Ellen

From: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: RE: JSS

Dear Ellen and colleagues,

Yes, please feel free to forward this message to anyone you think would be appropriate.

Best,
Andrew

From: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 8:31 PM
To: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: JSS

Hi Andrew and all,

Thanks so much for alerting us. I see something similar on Facebook. Do I have your permission to forward this message to Tim Jackson, Stephen Slottow, and Levi Walls (the current editor)? They should be informed and involved.

Thanks,
-Ellen

From: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>

Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 7:08 PM

To: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>

Subject: JSS

Dear colleagues,

I apologize for interrupting your weekends, but via twitter, I have been seeing that there has been some early and vociferous pushback re: the new issue of JSS, with concerns that Phillip Ewell wasn't invited to respond and that there is an anonymous contribution (are these still true? The last information I became privy to about the issue was in March). I imagine this is something JSS would want to address carefully especially in light of the past three months or so if this isn't already on the radar of everyone involved in JSS, since, from the looks of the social media attention it is possible that the situation could get serious.

Respectfully,
Andrew

July 29, 2020

Dear Dr. Richmond,

I appreciate your concern regarding the latest issue of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies and its reception by the scholarly community. I will address your questions in two separate categories; in addition, I will also express my own reflections on the situation.

1. What was the board's role in the publication of these essays? Was the board involved in the solicitation or review of these essays?

To clarify, my answer pertains to the essays in the "Symposium on Philip Ewell's SMT 2019 Plenary Paper, 'Music Theory's White Racial Frame'," not the other articles in the same volume.

I cannot speak for the entire editorial board, so I will start by explaining what my personal role was in the publication of the "Symposium" essays. This consisted of three parts:

- a) Beginning on November 15, 2019, I participated in an email exchange, initiated by Timothy Jackson, that eventually led to the Call for Responses that produced much of the "Symposium." The exchange began with Jackson's email titled "Not everyone was enthusiastic about Ewell's talk," and it was sent to a number of UNT music theory faculty. The emails were an exchange of opinions on Ewell's keynote talk. They led to another string of emails, which were directly related to the Call for responses. This string was initiated by Levi Walls, whose initial email (November 25, 2019) was sent to several theory faculty, including some that are *not* on the JSS editorial board. This second email exchange led to the formulation of the Call. I discussed the formulation with the others, but didn't make any substantive suggestions. On my part, I approved the Call on the same day, Monday 25, 2019. After that, I lost track of what happened with the further drafts of the Call, and only received the official Call for Responses via SMT-announce list (on December 31, 2019), which is the standard way to distribute music theory information.
- b) Approximately at the same time when the first email exchange began, that is in mid-November, Jackson began to talk about soliciting responses to Ewell's talk, to be published in the next issue of JSS (which is what ended up happening). I stress that this was *before* the Call for Responses was published via SMT-announce, and before it was even decided that such a call would be sent out. I think (though I cannot be entirely sure) that this informal solicitation happened as part of email exchanges between Jackson and Schenkerian scholars in and outside UNT. Jackson sent to me excerpts from some of these opinion emails in the first email string (initiated on November 15, see above). There were more emails in November and December, including an email string "German scientific racism," which Jackson sent just to me. In the process of these discussions, Jackson suggested that I contact my former PhD adviser William Rothstein,

a notable Schenkerian, to ask if he would like to contribute a response to Ewell's paper. Rothstein refused to do so, in an email to me from December 3, 2019.

- c) At some point in the spring 2020, Walls sent me a draft of the table of contents for the "Symposium." I said that the titles looked inconsistent. (They still do, in print.) I was never asked to look at the essays themselves, only at their titles.

This concludes my participation in the JSS "Symposium on Philip Ewell's SMT 2019 Plenary Paper." I knew that several people were working on their responses to Ewell, but never saw any of these essays, at any stage of their preparation or publication. The next time I heard about the "Symposium" was in a Facebook post on Saturday, July 25. The first time I saw these essays in print was the next day, July 26, when a Facebook friend distributed a scanned pdf copy of the "Symposium."

In summary, I was involved in the solicitation of these essays (though not those that were actually published), but I was not involved in their review.

The facts having been discussed, I now wish to express my own reflections on the process.

First of all, it is hard to distinguish between three things here: (1) what the JSS editorial board did, (2) what the broader Schenkerian community did, and (3) what UNT theory faculty did, in email conversations with Jackson and others. Jackson's and Walls's emails, at least those I myself got, were addressed not so much to the editorial board, but to UNT faculty, including those (like Andrew Chung) that are NOT on the editorial board. At the same time, Jackson alluded, more than once, to other Schenkerians (without naming them) who agreed with his own opinion. In retrospect, I can say that Jackson's (and to a certain extent Stephen Slottow's) actions produced an atmosphere of "we Schenkerians do not agree with Ewell's plenary talk," and this atmosphere was created not just by emails, but also by in-person conversations in UNT music building hallways. To be sure, Jackson himself expressed his disagreement very clearly in his emails, a lot of which later became part of his essay in JSS "Symposium." Jackson was "dragging" people into his "Symposium" project, and they (I should actually say "we") followed with various degrees of enthusiasm or reluctance. I stayed away from active participation in it as much as I could manage it without explicitly telling Jackson and Slottow "Sorry, I don't want to be involved."

As for the rest of the editorial board—the members who are *not* on the UNT faculty—I simply don't know whether they were involved in the formulation of the Call for Responses, or in any other stages of the process. The reason is that there was never a *formal* solicitation of opinions or essay reviews from the editorial board members.

In retrospect, I regret that I did not contact Ewell to ask if he would like to write a response to the responses, or to simply inform him about what is happening in JSS. A lack of such timely contact with Ewell on the part of JSS editorship is part of what is currently being condemned on social media. In fact, I did think of contacting him in December 2019, partly because he is a

long-time friend and a former mentor of mine. But it was a busy time at the end of the Fall semester, I was recovering after an illness, and most of all I thought that such contact ultimately should be made by the editors and the advisory board (that is, Graf, Wall, Jackson, Slottow). So I didn't write to Ewell. Now I think that this inaction was negligence. I should have at least urged the editors to get in touch with Ewell. Also, I now understand that, probably, the whole editorial board should have reviewed the essays at some point, since they engage the extremely sensitive topic of race and the work of a scholar (Ewell) who is courageous enough to publicly show his vulnerability in his SMT keynote.

I also think that a lack of formal communication between the advisory board, the editorial board, and the editors is part of a larger problem. Throughout the three years I have been a member of the editorial board, communication has been extremely inconsistent and unclear. At times, Jackson sends emails, often enormously voluminous, to multiple board members and non-JSS-affiliated UNT faculty, and it is unclear whether a response would be just in the spirit of friendship and collegiality, or whether this is official interaction between JSS officers and board members. Jackson's emails and his Schenker-style graphs attached to them are sometimes so big that it even seems irresponsible to send them and to expect people to read them. It is disrespectful of his colleagues' time. Further signs of inconsistency: in the summer 2017, Jackson asked me to review and/or proofread the entire (!) issue of JSS that was to come out that summer, within one day's notice. Putting off other duties, I read much of the issue within one day of his message and gave substantive comments, after which Jackson informed me that the journal issue has already gone into print, and my comments are too late. I have never felt as unappreciated as I did on that day.

In short, the communication between the advisory board (*especially* Jackson) and the rest of the JSS team is far from ideal. The role of the editorial board is unclear, and Jackson's actions often blurs the boundary between the JSS editorial board and UNT theory faculty.

(I must also say that I was an anonymous reviewer for one of the articles in the latest JSS issue, "The tour-of-key model" by Nicholas Stoia. This review process was very well organized and caused no problems. My contact during this review process was Benjamin Graf.)

2. Does the board endorse these essays?

The essays in the Symposium deal with one (of several) aspects of Philip Ewell's 2019 keynote paper: his discussion of the important music theory Heinrich Schenker (1868–1935). Specifically, Ewell exposes Schenker's racist views. I will give my judgment of several individual essays, rather than all of them together.

I endorse Suzannah Clark's essay "Patterns of Exclusion in Schenkerian Theory and Analysis." It is thoughtful work that deeply engages with problems of systemic racism as related to intellectuals from past eras. She shows that it is imperative to expose prejudice in the work of those thinkers who have become important figures in a scholarly field.

I endorse Christopher Segall's essay "Prolongational Analysis without Beams and Slurs." Segall argues that the role of Schenker himself in the current state of "Schenkerian" analysis is more limited than it is habitually thought. Therefore, Segall offers to dissociate prolongational analysis from Heinrich Schenker and his name. Rather than enforce the "exclusionary" notation of Schenkerian analysis, Segall suggests extracting some useful ideas from the work of Schenker and his followers—prolongation and structural levels, and use them as independent theoretical constructs, not necessarily carrying Schenker's difficult notational system.

I endorse Stephen Slottow's essay "An Initial Response to Philip Ewell." Slottow engages only two points from Ewell's keynote talk: (1) Slottow disagrees that pitch hierarchy in Classical tonality (in general and as seen by Schenker) is analogical to a hierarchy of races (the inferiority of people of color) that Schenker endorsed; (2) Slottow argues that Schenkerian theory is "a living, evolving tradition" that is *not* the same as Schenker's own work and personality. (In a way, this argument is close to Segall's; see above). Many of Schenker's follower have not shared his racist political views. I agree with both of Slottow's points.

I do NOT endorse Timothy Jackson's essay "A Preliminary Response to Ewell." Jackson shows a profound misunderstanding of two concepts: *white racial frame* and *systemic racism*. His discussion of "bringing Blacks up to 'standard'," and especially the statement about "deficiency of background in classical music" in African American communities bespeak a prejudice: Jackson doesn't see that there are different musics, produced by different cultures and racial groups, musics that are fundamentally equal in their inner value. Or, at least, he is uninterested in such equality. Instead, he focuses on Western (European) music alone, and sees one's lack of interest in this music as a "deficiency." In my view, Jackson needs to educate himself in matters of systemic discrimination before writing on these issues. I think I can safely say that his statement about "deficiency" is racist. (This said, I do find some parts of Jackson's essay interesting, in particular regarding the Jewish identity; but I do not consider myself qualified to judge them as right or wrong.) Jackson's false summary, in the same paragraph (p. 163) of Ewell's argument as follow: "liberalism is a racist conspiracy to deny rights to 'people of color'" is abhorrent, unscholarly, and unacceptable. This phrase (like the whole essay) shouldn't have been published.

I endorse the content of the anonymous essay, which states that Ewell's paper produced a wrong impression among many music theorists: that they took it to mean "let's abolish Schenker" (which Ewell did not mean), instead of taking Ewell's true point that white racial frame defines much of the field of music theory, a situation Ewell desires to change. However, the author clearly has not engaged with Ewell's discussion of white racial frame, since they state that most music schools focus on Classical instruments and repertoires, without examining why that is so. If I were reviewing this essay, I would have asked the author to engage with Ewell's central argument more directly.

I do NOT endorse the anonymity of this essay. It is unethical to publish anonymous work in response to a publicly known author.

The five essays discussed above are those I have read completely. I have not had enough time to read and form a clear opinion about the rest of the “Symposium” essays, and it would be irresponsible for me to offer judgment of work I have not fully read. If I were to review these essays in the proper way, I would have much more time, probably several months. Doing so within two days instead, and under extremely stressful conditions related to the JSS reception, is simply impossible. As I have already mentioned, I got access to the essays only on July 26, which is two days ago, and I am rushing to finish this letter as soon as possible. So, I do not endorse the remaining essays simply because I am not sufficiently familiar with them at the moment.

I also feel it is more responsible to judge every individual essay separately because each is written by a different person, rather than lump them together as if they represented some kind of unified view, which they do not.

Most importantly, I do NOT endorse the way in which these essays were put together, and the editors’ and the advisory board’s behavior: the lack of transparency, the inconsistent solicitation of essays, and the fact that the idea of the “Symposium” grew out of Jackson’s displeasure with Ewell’s keynote, rather than out an honest desire to see a variety of views and reactions. I felt this from the beginning (from November 2019) and I failed to let Jackson and Slottow know about my alarm. Part of the reason for this inaction, which I now regret, was that I feared for my own well-being in the College of Music, as an untenured faculty member. I wish to add that Jackson is the only MHTE faculty member of whom I am genuinely afraid, because his actions are not always guided by common professional and personal ethics. From the incident with the JSS “Symposium,” I have learned that I need to use my own head and make my own decisions in any situation, no matter how strange, ambiguous, or dangerous it may be.

I hope this helps you have a clearer view of how the “Symposium” came to be. Please do not hesitate to contact me if any additional information is needed.

Sincerely,

Ellen Bakulina, PhD
Assistant Professor, UNT College of Music

JSS discussion

Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>

Wed 7/29/2020 12:46 PM

To: Brand, Benjamin <Benjamin.Brand@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>; Heidelberger, Frank <Frank.Heidelberger@unt.edu>

Hi All,

When we had our "emergency" meeting on Sunday, I said that my contribution to the "Call for responses to Ewell" formulation was to suggest that the Call should be inclusive--that we must welcome different kinds of perspectives. I have just reviewed those emails one more time, and this is actually untrue: the idea of inclusivity was already there in Levi's original draft, and it was further mentioned by Andrew Chung. So it wasn't my suggestion at all.

Just making sure that it's all fair!

All best,
-Ellen

Ellen Bakulina (she, her, hers)

Zoom: 688 611 7365

Assistant Professor of Music Theory, University of North Texas College of Music
1155, Union Circle, Denton, TX, 76203, USA

Chair, Russian Music Theory Interest Group, SMT
Executive board member, Texas Society for Music Theory



UNT_000488

Regarding the Journal of Schenkerian Studies

Richmond, John <John.Richmond@unt.edu>

Fri 7/31/2020 9:35 AM

To: music faculty <musicfaculty@unt.edu>; music staff <musicstaff@unt.edu>; Music Adjunct <MusicAdjunct@unt.edu>

Cc: Cowley, Jennifer <Jennifer.Cowley@unt.edu>

The University of North Texas College of Music has begun a formal investigation into the conception and production of the twelfth volume of the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies*, which is published by the Center for Schenkerian Studies and UNT Press. The University, the College of Music, and the Division of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology reaffirm our dedication to combatting racism on campus and across all academic disciplines. We likewise remain deeply committed to the highest standards of music scholarship, professional ethics, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

John W. Richmond, Ph.D.

Professor and Dean of the UNT College of Music

Benjamin Brand, Ph.D.

Professor and Chair of the UNT Division of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology



UNT_000568

EXHIBIT D



AD HOC REVIEW PANEL



REPORT OF REVIEW OF CONCEPTION AND PRODUCTION OF VOL. 12 OF THE JOURNAL OF SCHENKERIAN STUDIES

NOVEMBER 25, 2020

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
The Panel Charge.....	3
Background Information & Scope of Review	3
Our Review.....	4
Report Structure.....	4
The Current Editorial Structure and General Review Processes.....	5
JSS Managerial Structure	5
JSS General Review Process	6
The Editorial and Review Processes Employed for Volume 12	6
The “Special Section” of Volume 12	6
The Editorial and Review Processes	7
Publication of Submissions by Dr. Jackson and Dr. Slottow.....	8
The Publication of an Anonymously Authored Contribution	8
Absence of Contribution from Dr. Ewell to the Special Section	9
Findings.....	9
Recommendations.....	13
Exhibits.....	15

Executive Summary

This is a report by the five-member Ad Hoc Journal Review Panel, comprised of UNT faculty members outside of the College of Music, who are current or former editors of scholarly journals. The panel was charged with examining the processes followed in the conception and production of Volume 12 of the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* (JSS), especially whether the standards of best scholarly practice were followed. Further, the panel was to make recommendation to improve editorial processes, where warranted.

After an extensive review of documents and interviews of eleven (11) individuals, including the principals involved in the conception and publication of Volume 12, the panel identifies significant problems with the editorial management structure of JSS as well as with the review processes employed by the journal for the special section in Volume 12.

In sum, we do not find that the standards of best practice in scholarly publication were observed in the production of Volume 12 of the JSS. The panel recommends

1. Changing the editorial structure of JSS
2. Making clear and transparent all editorial and review processes
3. Defining clearly the relationships between the journal editorial team and the editorial board, MHTE, and the UNT Press.

Report of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies Ad Hoc Review Panel

The Panel's Charge

The Ad Hoc Journal Review Panel is comprised of five faculty members who either currently serve, or have served, as scholarly journal editors. Members are: Jincheng Du, Professor of Materials Science and Engineering and Editor of *the Journal of American Ceramic Society*; Francisco Guzman, Professor of Marketing and current Coeditor-in-Chief of the *Journal of Product & Brand Management*; John Ishiyama, University Distinguished Research Professor of Political Science and former Editor-in-Chief of the *American Political Science Review* and the *Journal of Political Science Education*; Matthew Lemberger-Truelove, Professor of Counseling and current Editor of the *Journal of Counseling & Development*; and Jennifer Wallach, Professor of History, Chair of the Department of History and former Editor of *History Compass*.

On August 6, 2020, we received an email from Provost Jennifer Cowley that invited the members of the panel (all of who are faculty members from outside of the University of North Texas College of Music) to serve. In that email the Provost stated that the purpose of the panel was to examine “objectively the processes followed in the conception and production of Volume 12 of the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* (JSS). The panel will seek to understand whether the standards of best practice in scholarly publication were observed and will recommend strategies to improve editorial processes where warranted.” (Exhibit 1).

Our panel met with Provost Jennifer Cowley on August 12, 2020. At that meeting we were formerly charged by the Provost. This report includes a review of the managerial, editorial, and review processes employed by the JSS, and an examination of how those practices related to the production of Volume 12.

Background Information & Scope of Review

Given that the panel's charge was provided to the complete panel on August 14, 2020 (Dr. Francisco Guzman was added to the panel on that date) and that the Fall semester began on August 24, the panel members agreed to have our first organizational meetings after the semester began. Our first meeting was held on September 1, 2020. Between September 1 and October 15, we interviewed a total of eleven (11) individuals who had knowledge about the production of Volume 12, as well as of the general editorial and review processes employed by the journal. These included the journal's most recent editors (Dr. Benjamin Graf and Mr. Levi Walls), members of the editorial advisory team (Dr. Timothy Jackson and Dr. Stephen Slottow), representatives of the UNT Press (Mr. Ron Chrisman and Ms. Karen DeVinney)¹, the Division Head of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology (hereafter referred to as MHTE) (Dr. Benjamin Brand), and the Dean of the UNT College of Music (Dr. John Richmond). Further,

¹ The UNT Press publishes the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies*.

we interviewed three former members of the JSS editorial board (Dr. Ellen Bakulina and Dr. Diego Cubero) both faculty members of the UNT College of Music, and Dr. Graham Hunt, Professor and Associate Chair of Department of Music at the University of Texas at Arlington. All interviews were conducted virtually, via ZOOM. The panel also reviewed documents that were shared by the interviewees.

Our Review

To begin, we first reviewed the concerns expressed about the journal's editorial and review processes raised in public statements issued by three different groups:

- 1) the statement issued by the Executive Board of the Society of Music Theory (SMT) <https://societymusictheory.org/announcement/executive-board-response-journal-schenkerian-studies-vol-12-2020-07>; (Exhibit 2)
- 2) the statement of a group of graduate students from the Division of MHTE https://drive.google.com/file/d/1PekRT8tr5RXWRTW6Bqdaq57svqBRRcQK/view?show_popup=false; (Exhibit 3)
- 3) a statement in support of the graduate student statement made by faculty members of the Division of MHTE <https://www.ethnomusicology.org/news/519784/Statement-of-UNT-Faculty-on-Journal-of-Schenkerian-Studies.htm>. (Exhibit 4).

We examined these statements because they appeared to be representative of the broader public concerns expressed about the JSS Volume 12 and were the first to be publicly issued since its publication. These statements were authored by the major professional society of Music Theory (the executive board of SMT), and graduate students and faculty members from the Division of MHTE. The SMT statement reflects the reaction of the leadership of the profession, and the statements by the UNT MHTE faculty and graduate students represents the concerns of members of the UNT community familiar with music theory and the JSS.

All three statements raised serious concerns about the editorial and review practices employed by JSS. Given that our panel's charge was to focus on the concerns expressed about the editorial and review processes employed by the journal, we structured our review around three issues: 1) whether the journal's editorial team subjected submissions to Volume 12 to a process of peer review consistent with the standards of best practice in scholarly publication; 2) the circumstances surrounding the journal's publication of an anonymously authored contribution; and 3) the circumstances surrounding the JSS's decision not to invite the individual whose presentation at the SMT conference was the subject of Volume 12, Dr. Phillip Ewell, to respond in the symposium to the essays that discussed his work.

Report Structure

We report the results of our review in four sections:

- the general editorial and review processes employed by JSS;
- the editorial and review processes used for Volume 12;

- the process that led to the publication of an anonymously authored contribution; and
- the decision not to invite the scholar whose presentation was the topic of part of Volume 12 to respond to the essays that discussed his work

The Current Editorial Structure and General Review Processes

To assess whether the editorial and peer review processes employed by JSS meet “standards of best practice in scholarly publication” (as stated in the panel’s charge) it is important to outline the current editorial managerial and review processes used by JSS.

JSS Managerial Structure

Based upon our review of the journal’s website (<https://mhete.music.unt.edu/journal-schenkerian-studies>), which only describes the submission process, and our interviews with the editors and the editorial advisory board, the journal’s managerial structure includes an editor, [previously Dr. Benjamin Graf, who was to be succeeded by Levi Walls], an “editorial advisory board” comprised of Dr. Jackson and Dr. Slottow, who provide “guidance” for the journal, and an editorial board made up of scholars in the field who are often asked to review manuscripts. The editorial board has no supervisory role and is not provided with annual journal status reports. It appears that its function is to provide a pool of potential reviewers for submitted manuscripts.

The editor of the journal has always been a graduate student, except Benjamin Graf, who was a graduate student when he started the editor of JSS in 2014 and earned his PhD from UNT MHTE in May 2016 and is currently employed as a Lecturer by the Division. Although the justification as provided by the editorial advisors was that JSS is a “student run journal” (although Dr. Ben Graf was appointed as a UNT Senior Lecturer in Fall 2017 and was therefore not a student for volume 12) which is designed to provide editorial experience for graduate students, Dr. Slottow and Dr Jackson stated that the journal actually publishes mostly works from established scholars rather than students. The panel was told that the student-editors largely made all decisions regarding publication of manuscripts.

It appears that historically all the editors of JSS have been students of Dr. Jackson. The editors who were interviewed by the panel reported that they were uncomfortable in making decisions and recommendations that ran counter to the preferences of Dr. Jackson, their major faculty advisor. In part, Dr. Graf and Mr. Walls said to us that this situation made it difficult to raise objections relating to concerns about the submissions to the symposium section of Volume 12.² According to the editors, as well as to Dr. Slottow, Dr. Jackson “took the lead” on this section

² Dr. Jackson said that this portion of Vol 12 is “like a commentary” section in his meeting with our panel. However, this was not called a commentary section when the volume was published. Rather, in the table of contents the section containing the pieces about Dr. Ewell’s talk are labeled “symposium” (Exhibit 5). The panel notes there is no special marker in Volume 12, including in the symposium section, that designates any piece as a “commentary.”

in Volume 12.³ Drs. Slottow and Jackson said that this was the first time the journal had published such a special section.⁴

JSS General Review Process

In terms of the general review processes used by JSS, no written processes for review were provided to the panel and after questioning the editors, no such document exists. However, the editors and editorial advisors described the general review process as involving recruiting two reviewers (sometimes from the editorial board but at times recruited from outside the editorial board) who would provide a report to the editors and then a decision was made whether to accept, reject, or invite a revise and resubmission of the piece. Dr. Graf told the committee that rejection was a very rare occurrence.

No documents were provided that described the normal review process, although Dr. Jackson provided us with a collection of emails that he said outlined the review process for what he referred to as the “commentary” section of Volume 12. These emails however only generally discussed the special section in Volume 12 and did not lay out specifically the review procedures to be employed for these essays.

The Editorial and Review Processes Employed for Volume 12

As to the review process employed for Volume 12, Dr. Jackson told us that this type of special section had never been done by JSS before.⁵ Volume 12 also included three “regular” articles (a term used by Dr. Graf), which had been peer reviewed and were scheduled to be published in Volume 12. The processing of these articles had been completed by November 2019. For these three articles, Dr. Graf was designated as the editor. For the special section (referred to as a symposium in the table of contents for Volume 12), Levi Walls was designated as the editor.

The “Special Section” of Volume 12

In our discussion with Drs. Jackson and Slottow, both said they felt the need to include articles responding to “attacks” on Schenkerian scholars by Dr. Ewell in his plenary talk at the SMT conference, and that JSS was the appropriate venue for such responses. In explaining this decision, both Dr. Jackson and Dr. Slottow noted that unlike prior plenaries at SMT where a

³ In his interview with the panel, Dr. Jackson repeatedly referred to the section as a “commentary” section suggesting that this meant that the essays did not require peer review. Yet in the email correspondence sent by him to others discussing this section, prior to our interview with him, the term “symposium” or “symposia” is mentioned 22 times, but the term “commentary” is not mentioned at all.

⁴ There had been previous volumes where the entire volume was dedicated to a special topic, but not a section of a regular volume. For purpose of this report, the term “special section” will be used to refer to the section of Volume 12 containing the essays that respond to Dr. Ewell’s presentation. Where pertinent, the report will use the words “symposium” and “commentary.”

⁵ Commentary sections vary from journal to journal, but they generally involve commentaries provided about articles that are published by the journal. A symposium on the other hand refers to a section of a journal that includes several short articles built around a particular topic.

question and answer session was held after the talk was completed, no such session occurred after Dr. Ewell's talk. Thus, they said they believed that it was necessary that a response be made to Dr. Ewell's talk as soon as possible, and that those responses should appear in JSS. According to Benjamin Graf, who was then editor of JSS, three (3) "normal" articles had already been completed or nearly completed by December, which would have been the normal number of articles published in a journal volume.⁶

However, Dr. Jackson said that after Dr. Ewell's talk, he believed it necessary to include responses to the talk in Volume 12. Thus, a special call for submissions that would respond to Dr. Ewell's talk was distributed at the end of December 2019, and an expedited process was initiated to process the submissions quickly. The deadline set in the call for submissions was January 20, 2020. (Exhibit 6). In short, a call for contributions was made at the end of December, with the intention of completing the entire process by March 2020, (i.e., within roughly three months).

The Editorial and Review Processes

Mr. Levi Walls, who was slotted to succeed Dr. Graf as editor, was charged with editing the special section of Volume 12. Mr. Walls reported that the pieces that were published as part of this section were not subject to peer review, and this was confirmed by Drs. Graf, Slottow, and Jackson. Dr. Jackson stated that since the pieces were meant to be "commentaries" and not "normal articles," they did not require peer review. He explained that peer review was unnecessary because: 1) the contributors were all very notable scholars in the field and their reputations were sufficient to guarantee the quality of the contributions;⁷ and 2) all of the editors (which we understand to mean Drs. Jackson, Slottow, Walls, and Graf) read every piece suggesting that these contributions were "editor reviewed."

⁶ According to the representatives of the UNT Press, Ron Chrisman and Karen DeVinney the deadline for the UNT Press to receive articles for publication in Volume 12 was March 2020.

⁷ According to Levi Walls, the standard used to assess the quality of the contributions in the special section of Volume 12 was the reputation of the author of the contribution. In other words, other normally used criteria for evaluation of contributions to JSS were not used for the special section. Mr. Walls shared with us an excerpt from an email where Dr. Jackson responded to questions about the review process for the contributions to the special section:

"The majority of the authors are well-known, highly seasoned scholars, ranging from the Chair of the Harvard Music Department to the authors of books on Schenker and Schenkerian analysis. If you want to use the word "vetting" in this context of allowing distinguished scholars to communicate their views, then you can say that the respondents were "vetted" on the basis of their academic qualifications. The distinguished pedigrees of the contributors is supported by their short biographies at the end of the issue."

However, Dr. Graf and Dr. Slottow said that they did not read every contribution. Both said they only read a few, in contrast to the claim made by Dr. Jackson that all the editors read every contribution.

Levi Walls informed the panel that he read each piece but had multiple concerns, as the editor, about proceeding with several of the contributions. He said he shared these concerns with Dr. Benjamin Brand (the Division Head of MHTE) and Dr. Graf, and then directly with Dr. Jackson. However, he said these concerns were dismissed by Dr. Jackson.⁸

Mr. Walls reported to the panel that he raised concerns to Dr. Jackson about the content of the pieces as well as the quality of writing in February 2020. He stated that after raising concerns, he was taken into Dr. Jackson's car, where Dr. Jackson told him that it was not his "job to censor people" and was told not to do it again. He said Dr. Jackson told him that since these were senior scholars, their reputations were enough to vet them. Dr. Graf confirmed that Levi Walls shared information about his encounter with Dr. Jackson around the time of its occurrence. This was followed by the final decision, made by Dr. Jackson (according to both Dr. Graf and Mr. Walls) to proceed with the publication of several of the pieces without substantial modifications.

Publication of Submissions by Dr. Jackson and Dr. Slottow

Both Dr. Jackson and Dr. Slottow contributed pieces to the special section of Volume 12. When asked about precautions taken to prevent a potential conflict of interest that arose with the publication of papers by Dr. Jackson and Dr. Slottow in Volume 12 (since Dr. Jackson made the final decision on publication), none of the editors, nor the editorial advisors, could identify any special precautions employed to address these potential conflicts of interest.

The Publication of an Anonymously Authored Contribution

Our panel also reviewed the process that led to the publication of an anonymously authored contribution. The panel noted, first, anonymous contributions, although uncommon, are not unprecedented in academic journal publishing. Several notable examples exist historically. For instance, an article in an International Relations journal, *Foreign Affairs*, was authored by a person who was assigned the pseudonym "X" in 1947.⁹ In 2000, in the field of Political Science, there was a contribution critical of the *American Political Science Review* authored by an individual using the pseudonym "Mr. Perestroika." Although not an academic journal, an editorial in the *New York Times* last year, which was highly critical of the President Donald Trump administration, was purportedly written by an "insider" and was authored anonymously. Thus, there are some limited precedents where editors allow anonymously authored contributions.

⁸ Dr. Brand confirmed this meeting with Levi Walls when we interviewed him. Dr. Graf confirmed the existence of email communications between him and Mr. Walls about Mr. Walls' concerns.

⁹ The author later was identified as George Kennan, a United States diplomat.

The editorial advisory team of Drs. Jackson and Slottow apparently made the decision to proceed with publication of the anonymous piece. Levi Walls informed the panel that he raised concerns about this contribution with Dr. Jackson. The panel asked the editorial advisors the reason for allowing the publication of an anonymously authored contribution. Dr Jackson informed the panel that anonymity was granted because the author of that piece feared retaliation that would jeopardize the author's career. He reported that the author was a junior scholar.¹⁰

Absence of Contributions from Dr. Ewell to the “commentary” section

The panel asked the editors (Dr. Graf and Mr. Walls) and the editorial advisors (Drs. Jackson and Slottow) why Dr. Ewell was not invited to respond to the contributions in Volume 12, and whether that had been considered. All of them replied that inviting Dr. Ewell had not been considered until controversy arose concerning the volume in the summer of 2020. Only then did the idea emerge that perhaps Dr. Ewell could be invited to respond in Volume 13. However, that was not part of the original plan and was only considered as an option once the controversy over the contents of Volume 12 escalated.

Further, both Dr. Jackson and Dr. Slottow said that they believed that since Dr. Ewell had been given an uninterrupted opportunity to express his viewpoints at the SMT conference, commentators on Dr. Ewell's talk should also have the opportunity to express their views freely. Thus, Dr. Ewell was not invited for that reason. In retrospect, Dr. Slottow expressed regret about that decision.

Findings

After completing our review regarding the four concerns listed above, we find the following:

- 1) In general terms, there are several structural problems with the editorial and review processes employed by the journal generally and Volume 12 specifically.
 - a. There is a structural flaw in the power disparity between the JSS editor (a graduate student or former graduate student) and the editorial advisor, Dr. Jackson. In many ways this created a fundamental power asymmetry in the management of the journal. This was acknowledged in an interview by Dr. Slottow when he acknowledged that this “power imbalance” was a major problem with the journal. This was also observed by the current journal editors and other members of the editorial board

Indeed, since the editors were invariably students of Dr. Jackson, this made it very difficult for the editors to contradict his wishes. Both the editors, Dr. Graf and Mr. Walls, reported to us they felt unable to voice their concerns about the

¹⁰ The committee did not ask the name of the author and the committee was not provided any documents about the identity of the author.

editorial process in general and that this was especially true for the “commentary” section of Volume 12.

This arrangement also exposed the graduate student editors to potential negative consequences, particularly if controversy arose over what was published (e.g. Volume 12). The editor should not have been a graduate student, especially for a potentially very controversial issue.

- b. There are no clear procedures that ensure that potential conflicts of interest in the review process are avoided with regard to editor (or editorial advisor) self-publication. As one widely known and authoritative organization that provides guidance for journal editors and publishers, the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE 2019, 7), states, a “journal must have a procedure for handling submissions from editors or members of the editorial board that will ensure that the peer review is handled independently of the author/editor.”¹¹ Moreover, COPE recommends that if an editor publishes in their own journal that the process is clearly described in a note in the volume once the paper is published. Given the structure of editorial management of the journal, the panel does not believe that procedures to ensure the avoidance of conflicts of interest have been adopted or followed in the publication of any volume of the JSS, including Volume 12.
- c. There are no written procedures employed by JSS to ensure that transparent review processes are conducted. This practice is not consistent with standards for editorial management. COPE recommends that “all peer review processes must be transparently described and well managed. Journals should provide training for editors and reviewers and have policies on diverse aspects of peer review, especially with respect to adoption of appropriate models of review and processes for handling conflicts of interest, appeals and disputes that may arise in peer review” (<https://publicationethics.org/peerreview>). There is no evidence that this was the general practice employed at JSS, or the practice employed for Volume 12.

2) The editorial and review processes used for Volume 12.

- a. The special section for Volume 12 was conceived between late December 2019, when a call for contributions was issued, and March (the planned date for

¹¹ The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to define best practices in the ethics of scholarly publishing and to assist editors, publishers, etc. to achieve this. COPE also has links with the *Council of Science Editors*, the *European Association of Science Editors*, the *International Society of Managing and Technical Editors*, the *World Association of Medical Editors*, *Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association*, *Directory of Open Access Journals*, and the *Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers*. It is also used as guidelines for major university publishers such as Cambridge University Press and Oxford University Press.

completion). No defined procedures for the special section were established. This is unusual given that this was the first time such a section had been included in JSS, and the editorial team knew, or reasonably should have anticipated, that it would be controversial. There is no evidence that the editorial team engaged in a careful deliberative process in laying out how such a special section would be put together. Although in the experiences of members of the panel there is no universal standard that governs procedures for journal special sections, the fact that the editorial team had not carefully laid out a plan as to how to process contributions, at the very least, indicates a lapse in judgment and decision making.

- b. In the panel's meeting with Dr. Jackson, he indicated that the symposium in Volume 12 more closely reflects what is customarily understood as a "commentary" section in academic journals. Although Dr Jackson contended that the contributions in response to Dr. Ewell's presentation are consistent with commentary pieces, as noted in footnote 5 above, these pieces really were much more like a symposium. Commentaries are generally seen as referring to papers already published in the journal, not on topics such as that addressed in volume 12.¹² In any case, there is nothing to indicate that these contributions were part of an *a priori* planned "commentary" section, but rather was a symposium. Symposia in journals, at least the ones with which the expert panel are familiar, are subject to peer review. This clearly did not happen in Volume 12.

There is a precedence in academic journal publishing for "editorial reviews," which is generally limited to Book Reviews. However, these require multiple

¹² This finding is based on the panel's experience as well as our review of "commentary" sections of numerous journals in a variety of academic fields. Although not a collectively exhaustive list, the following exemplify what is generally meant by the term. A commentary is defined by the journal *Music Theory Online* (an SMT publication) as "focused on a particular article or other published item" in the journal (<https://mtosmt.org/docs/authors.html#Submit>). This conceptualization of commentaries is shared across disciplines. A journal in health studies defines a commentary as "generally short, and usually blends scholarship and opinion that comment on a newly published article" by the journal (*International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being* <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4789530/>). Similarly a journal in the social sciences, the *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, defines a commentary as a response to articles published in that journal or "short (2-3 pages maximum), narrowly focused articles that are responses of recently published articles that are interesting enough to warrant further comment or explanation." <https://journalofinequalitiesandapplications.springeropen.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript/commentary>). In many journals the commentaries are peer reviewed. In others, such as the latter, the commentaries are editor reviewed. What appeared in Volume 12 of JSS do not generally qualify as commentaries, at least in the sense of the way "commentary" is used in many scholarly journals with which the panel is familiar (including the *American Political Science Review*).

members of the editorial team to agree to publication to ensure that conflicts of interest do not jeopardize the integrity of the publication process.

However, in the case of the essays that commented on Dr. Ewell's talk, there appears to have been no peer or complete editorial review of the pieces published. Although Dr. Jackson stated several times that all of the essays were reviewed by all of the editors and editorial advisors, at least two of them said they had not read all of the essays, and Levi Walls said he raised significant concerns about several essays (including concerns about the content of the essays and the quality of the writing) but those concerns were later dismissed by Dr. Jackson. Only Dr. Jackson states that he reviewed all the pieces, but he also said that his editorial criteria were the academic status and reputation of the contributors.¹³ This may be the criteria for inclusion in a newsletter or a generally unreviewed electronic posting, but this is not an established or accepted criterion for judging publishable merit in a reputable academic journal.

3) The publication of an anonymously authored contribution.

- a. As noted above, Dr Jackson justified publication of an anonymously authored piece because the author was fearful of retaliation. Regarding this situation, COPE acknowledges that there are no clear guidelines as a journal publishing standard regarding publishing anonymously. However, COPE observes that publishing anonymously is typically not permitted by publishers because of concerns about author transparency and because publishers believe that they should publish in the highest ethical regard. This is also the panel members' experience-- publishers do not favor publishing anonymously because of concerns about author transparency. COPE acknowledges that in rare cases papers can be published anonymously where an author is at risk of physical danger or is in fear for his/her life if his/her name were to be published or associated with specific criticism. COPE, however, acknowledges that a decision to publish anonymously solely because of possible damage to the author's career is ultimately up to the editor, but cautions: "Is the editor confident that he/she is knowledgeable in this specific discipline that he can make such an editorial judgment?" (<https://publicationethics.org/case/anonymity-versus-author-transparency>).
- b. In the view of the panel the reasoning for this decision could have been communicated to readers of JSS via an editorial note that explained the decision to publish a contribution anonymously (without details that would compromise

¹³ The members of the panel are not aware of this criterion being used in determining whether submissions should be published in a journal, particularly one that represents itself as peer reviewed, unless Volume 12 contained a disclaimer stating that this volume was not peer reviewed (which it did not).

the identity of the author). No such explanatory note was provided in Volume 12.

- 4) Absence of invitation for Dr. Ewell to respond to the contributions to the “commentary” section.
 - a. Although generally it is a practice among the academic journals with which the panel is familiar, that when there are specific sections of a journal that are devoted to discussing a particular author’s works, the author whose work is being discussed/critiqued is generally invited to provide a rejoinder. This does not necessarily have to be in the issue in which the critique appears (although that is a good editorial practice), the critiqued author should at least be afforded the opportunity in the issue immediately following and should be informed of that opportunity.
 - b. However, there is no indication that the journal editorial team intended on inviting Dr. Ewell to provide such a rejoinder in the initial planning for the “commentary” section of Volume 12. This was only discussed after the volume was released in the Summer of 2020.

In sum, based on the above, we do not find that the standards of best practice in scholarly publication were observed in the production of Volume 12 of the JSS.

In addition to our findings above, the panel also notes that there appears to be no oversight mechanisms concerning the operations of JSS. The members of the JSS editorial board we interviewed reported that they have received no updates nor reports on the operations of the journal. These reports typically include the number of manuscripts received, the number processed, the average time for completion of reviews (including invitations to revise and resubmit pieces), the number of manuscripts accepted, average time for processing of accepted manuscripts and demographic characteristics of authors, as well as other information as required by the publisher or supervising professional society (or the university in this case). This is what is contained in a typical report, but such reports do not appear to exist. It is a common practice for many journals to provide such periodic reports.

Recommendations

The panel was also asked to make recommendations, where warranted.¹⁴ Several individuals we interviewed stated that the JSS plays an important role in the field of Music Theory and is one of the only outlets for the publication of works employing Schenkerian analysis. The panel thus recommends continuation of the journal.

However, we recommend that fundamental structural changes be made to the journal

¹⁴ The panel is aware there have been calls for the dissolution of JSS.

1. The journal implement the necessary reforms before another volume is published. These include:
 - a. Changing the editorial structure
 - b. Making clear and transparent all editorial and review processes
 - c. Defining clearly the relationships between the editors of the journal and the editorial board, MHTE, and the UNT Press.
2. We do not believe that the current editorial management structure is viable or sufficient for a healthy academic journal. There should be an editor who is (or who are) a full-time faculty member, preferably a tenured faculty member. It is possible that a graduate student could act as “associate editor” or “editorial assistant”, thus continuing the functions of the previous “editor” position at JSS (to provide the student with professional experiences), but decisions regarding manuscripts should only be made by the faculty editor.

We recommend that this editor be provided with a term in office of three years, with the possibility of renewal. This will help institutionalize editorial accountability.

It may be worth considering selecting an editor (or perhaps co-editors) who is/are not a faculty member(s) in MHTE at UNT. We recommend that consideration be given for the possibility of an editor recruited from outside of MHTE and/or UNT. These measures will help reassure public audiences of UNT’s commitment to the reform of the journal.

3. All procedures regarding peer review processes, and special sections, should be written down and made publicly available. Further procedures to avoid potential conflicts of interest should be clearly laid out (including precautions regarding editor self-publication).
4. The editorial board should have oversight over the journal, and regular annual reports on the activities of the journal should be provided to the editorial board and the UNT Press. In addition, the term of office for editor should be fixed, after which time the UNT Press should review what has been accomplished during the term. Further, if a student editorial assistant is to be appointed at UNT, there should be frequent consultations regarding the graduate assistantship provided to the journal by MHTE, and related financial issues with the Division Head of MHTE.

References

Committee on Publications Ethics (COPE) 2019. *GUIDELINES: A Short guide to ethical editing for new editors*. At https://publicationethics.org/files/COPE_G_A4_SG_Ethical_Editing_May19_SCREEN_AW-website.pdf, accessed October 1, 2020.

Exhibits

Case 4:21-cv-00033-ALM Document 1-5 Filed 01/14/21 Page 18 of 27 PageID #: 280
EXHIBIT 1

Ad Hoc Panel Communication

Cowley, Jennifer <Jennifer.Cowley@unt.edu>

Thu 8/6/2020 4:55 PM

To: Wallach, Jennifer <Jennifer.Wallach@unt.edu>; Ishiyama, John <John.Ishiyama@unt.edu>; Du, Jincheng <Jincheng.Du@unt.edu>; Lemberger-Truelove, Matthew <Matthew.Lemberger-truelove@unt.edu>; Dubrow, Jehanne <Jehanne.Dubrow@unt.edu>

Dear Panel Members,

First a thank you for agreeing to serve on the Ad Hoc Panel that will be convening next week. I will be sharing your charge when we meet on the 12th.

I am sharing with you the following statement that UNT has issued regarding the formation of this panel.

The University of North Texas is committed to academic freedom and the responsibility that goes along with this freedom. This dedication is consistent with, and not in opposition to, our commitment to diversity and inclusion and to the highest standards of scholarship and professional ethics.

The university has appointed a five-member multidisciplinary panel of University of North Texas faculty experienced in the editing and production of scholarly journals. The panel members, who are outside the College of Music, will examine objectively the processes followed in the conception and production of volume 12 of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies. The panel will seek to understand whether the standards of best practice in scholarly publication were observed, and will recommend strategies to improve editorial processes where warranted. Upon completion of its investigation, the panel will issue a report to UNT Provost Jennifer Cowley. The report will be made public.

The Journal of Schenkerian Studies has made many contributions to the understanding of music theory. We will continue to offer music theorists the opportunity to share and defend diverse viewpoints under the most rigorous academic standards and ethics.

I wanted to alert you that the publication of this journal volume has generated significant media interest. While you have not specifically been named, should you be contacted by a member of the media, you can refer any inquiry to Jim.Berscheidt@unt.edu in University Communications.


Sincerely,
Jennifer Cowley, PhD
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of North Texas

Jennifer.cowley@unt.edu

940-565-2550



The Executive Board of the Society for Music Theory condemns the anti-Black statements and personal ad hominem attacks on Philip Ewell perpetuated in several essays included in the “Symposium on Philip Ewell’s 2019 SMT Plenary Paper” published by the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies*.



The Executive Board of the Society for Music Theory condemns the anti-Black statements and personal ad hominem attacks on Philip Ewell perpetuated in several essays included in the “Symposium on Philip Ewell’s 2019 SMT Plenary Paper” published by the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies*.

The conception and execution of this symposium failed to meet the ethical, professional, and scholarly standards of our discipline. Some contributions violate our Society’s policies on harassment and ethics.

As reported by participants, the journal’s advisory board did not subject submissions to the normal processes of peer review, published an anonymously authored contribution, and did not invite Ewell to respond in a symposium of essays that discussed his own work. Such behaviors are silencing, designed to exclude and to replicate a culture of whiteness. These are examples of professional misconduct, which in this case enables overtly racist behavior. We humbly acknowledge that we have much work to do to dismantle the whiteness and systemic racism that deeply shape our discipline. The Executive Board is committed to making material interventions to foster anti-racism and support BIPOC scholars in our field, and is meeting without delay to determine further actions.

- Patricia Hall, President
- Robert Hatten, Past-President
- Gretchen Horlacher, Vice President
- Philip Stoecker, Secretary
- Jocelyn Neal, Treasurer
- Inessa Bazayev
- Anna Gawboy
- Julia H. ...

EXHIBIT 3

I am sharing this statement on behalf of a cross-section of graduate students in the Division of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology (MHTE) at the University of North Texas, the department which is responsible for publishing the Journal of Schenkerian Studies (JSS).

We are appalled by the journal's platforming of racist sentiments in response to Dr. Philip Ewell's plenary address at the Society of Music Theory annual meeting in 2019. Furthermore, we condemn the egregious statements written by UNT faculty members within this publication. We stand in solidarity with Dr. Philip Ewell and his goals to address systemic racism in and beyond the field of music theory.

As graduate students at UNT, we are compelled to provide further context and to demand action to effect meaningful change. We would like to make it clear that the JSS is not a graduate student journal; since 2010 (Vol. 4), it has been run primarily by Drs. Timothy Jackson and Stephen Slottow. Many of us recently discovered that the journal is presented as graduate-student run in some contexts; in fact, there is little student involvement beyond copy-editing, and students have absolutely no say in the content of the JSS. In fact, outside of the advisory board (and in particular Dr. Jackson), we have no clear understanding of who oversaw the publication of the responses to the plenary session. As we join the search for answers to these issues, we will be working both publicly and privately to change every part of the MHTE Division and College of Music (CoM) at UNT that allowed faculty to platform racism in our name.

To this end, we as UNT graduate students demand the Journal of Schenkerian Studies should immediately take the following steps, and we call on the UNT College of Music and university at large to ensure these steps are taken.

1. **Publicly condemn the issue and release it freely online to the public.** Given the horrendous lack of peer review, publication of an anonymous response, and clear lack of academic rigor, this issue of the JSS should release an apology for its content and promote transparency by granting the public access to it. We believe that all contributors should be held fully accountable for their comments, which must not be hidden for the sake of the self-preservation of any involved parties. Furthermore, we must learn from these mistakes rather than attempt to erase them. By making this volume accessible to the public with a disclaimer from the CoM, we hope to enable all scholars to address this problematic "discourse."
2. **Provide a full public account of the editorial and publication process, and its failures.** Throughout the publication of this issue, significant irregularities occurred in the acceptance and solicitation processes, whether individuals with the title of editor were permitted to edit content, and how the contents of Issue 12 were approved by any responsible oversight process. JSS must make a public account of the process so individuals who intentionally subverted academic discourse can be held accountable by their respective institutions.

We also call on the University of North Texas and the UNT College of Music to take the following actions.

1. **Dissolve the JSS.** The JSS has demonstrated that it does not meet the standards of a peer-reviewed publication. The publication of this issue demonstrates that the JSS, through its subversion of academic processes, is not in fact peer reviewed and lacks rigor. The basis of academic discourse is trust and authenticity, and the JSS has violated that trust. Without accountability and responsible scholarship, there is no reason for it to exist.


2. **Critically examine the culture in UNT, the CoM, and the MHTE Division, and act to change our culture.** UNT has gained a reputation as an institution with a toxic culture when it comes to issues of race, gender, and other aspects of diversity. Although we would like to imagine that these problems are behind us, the JSS has proven that our department's culture remains toxic, and it needs to change. While we as graduate students are working to change the culture, the university must be a part of the solution. If institutional inertia impedes this change, UNT and the College of Music are a part of the problem, not the solution.

3. **Hold accountable every person responsible for the direction of the publication.** This will involve recognizing both whistleblowers and those who failed to heed them in this process. This should also extend to investigating past bigoted behaviors by faculty and, by taking this into account, the discipline and potential removal of faculty who used the JSS platform to promote racism. Specifically, the actions of Dr. Jackson—both past and present—are particularly racist and unacceptable.

We sincerely apologize to Dr. Philip Ewell for these racist attacks on his scholarship and character. We firmly support Dr. Ewell, and his call to critically examine the racial frameworks in which Schenkerian analysis and other theories were developed. We gratefully acknowledge the push for inclusion and diversity in academia, and his continued work for diversity and anti-racism in the field of music theory, which he advocated for in his 2019 SMT plenary address. In the weeks, months, and years ahead, we will strive to change the toxic culture at UNT. We recognize that this will be difficult work, and we are prepared to fight for inclusivity now and in the future.

EXHIBIT 4

News from SEM: General News

 Email to a Friend

Statement of UNT Faculty on Journal of Schenkerian Studies

Friday, July 31, 2020 (0 Comments)

Posted by: Stephen Stuempfle

[Share](#) |

We, the undersigned faculty members of the University of North Texas Division of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology, stand in solidarity with our graduate students in their letter of condemnation of the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies*. We wish to stress that we are speaking for ourselves individually and not on behalf of the university. The forthcoming issue—a set of responses to Dr. Philip Ewell's plenary lecture at the 2019 Society for Music Theory annual meeting (<https://vimeo.com/372726003>)—is replete with racial stereotyping and tropes, and includes personal attacks directed at Dr. Ewell. To be clear, not all responses contain such egregious material; some were thoughtful, and meaningfully addressed and amplified Dr. Ewell's remarks about systemic racism in the discipline. But the epistemic center of the journal issue lies in a racist discourse that has no place in any publication, especially an academic journal. The fact that he was not afforded the opportunity to respond in print is unacceptable, as is the lack of a clearly defined peer-review process.

We endorse the call for action outlined in our students' letter (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1PekRT8tr5RXWRTW6Bqdaq57svqBRRcQK/view>), which asks that the College of Music “publicly condemn the issue and release it freely online to the public” and “provide a full public account of the editorial and publication process, and its failures.” Responsible parties must be held appropriately accountable.

The treatment of Prof. Ewell's work provides an example of the broader system of oppression built into the academic and legal institutions in which our disciplines exist. As faculty at the College of Music we must all take responsibility for not only publicly opposing racism in any form, but to address and eliminate systematic racism within our specific disciplines.

Dr. Ellen Bakulina, Assistant Professor, Music Theory

Andrew Chung, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Music Theory

Dr. Diego Cubero, Assistant Professor, Music Theory

Steven Friedson, University Distinguished Research Professor, Ethnomusicology/Ethnomusicology Area Coordinator

Rebecca Dowd Geoffroy-Schwinden, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Music History

Benjamin Graf, Ph.D., Senior Lecturer, Music Theory

Dr. Frank Heidelberg, Professor, Music Theory/Music Theory Area Coordinator

Bernardo Illari, Associate Professor, Music History

Dr. Justin Lavacek, Assistant Professor, Music Theory

Dr. Peter Mondelli, Associate Professor, Music History

Dr. Margaret Notley, Professor of Music/Coordinator of Music History Area

Dr. April L. Prince, Principal Lecturer, Music History

Cathy Ragland, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Ethnomusicology

Dr. Gillian Robertson, Senior Lecturer, Music Theory

Dr. Hendrik Schulze, Associate Professor, Music History

JACKSON000228

Vivek Virani, Ph.D. Assistant Professor, Ethnomusicology and Music Theory

Dr. Brian F. Wright Assistant Professor, Music History

Add Comment

« Back to Index

EXHIBIT 5

Journal of Schenkerian Studies

VOLUME 12

2019

CONTENTS

JOHN KOSLOVSKY Schenkerizing <i>Tristan</i> , Past and Present	1
BRYAN J. PARKHURST The Hegelian Schenker, The Un-Schenkerian Hegel, and How to Be a Dialectician about Music	55
NICHOLAS STOIA The Tour-of-Keys Model and the Prolongational Structure in Sonata-Form Movements by Haydn and Mozart	79
Symposium on Philip Ewell's SMT 2019 Plenary Paper, "Music Theory's White Racial Frame"	125–214
INTRODUCTION	125
DAVID BEACH Schenker–Racism–Context	127
RICHARD BEAUDOIN After Ewell: Music Theory and "Monstrous Men"	129
JACK BOSS Response to P. Ewell	133
CHARLES BURKHART Response to Philip Ewell	135
ALLEN CADWALLADER A Response to Philip Ewell	137

SUZANNAH CLARK	
Patterns of Exclusion in Schenkerian Theory and Analysis	141
NICHOLAS COOK	
Response to Philip Ewell	153
TIMOTHY L. JACKSON	
A Preliminary Response to Ewell	157
STEPHEN LETT	
De-Scripting Schenker, Scripting Music Theory	167
RICH PELLEGRIN	
Detail, Reduction, and Organicism: A Response to Philip Ewell	173
BOYD POMEROY	
Schenker, Schenkerian Theory, Ideology, and Today's Music Theory Curricula	179
CHRISTOPHER SEGALL	
Prolongational Analysis without Beams and Slurs: A View from Russian Music Theory	183
STEPHEN SLOTTOW	
An Initial Response to Philip Ewell	189
BARRY WIENER	
Philip Ewell's White Racial Frame	195
ANONYMOUS	
An Anonymous Response to Philip Ewell	207
BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE RESPONSES.....	209
CONTRIBUTORS	215

EXHIBIT 6

Journal of Schenkerian Studies vol. 12 (2019) Call for Papers

The SMT plenary presentation given by Philip Ewell, "Music Theory's White Racial Frame," has inspired a good deal of debate within the theory community, especially regarding the possible relationship between Schenkerian methodology and the white racial frame¹ (as suggested in the following quote from Ewell):

"The best example through which to examine our white frame is through Heinrich Schenker, a fervent racist, whose racism undoubtedly influenced his music theory, yet it gets whitewashed for general consumption.....In his voluminous writings, Schenker often mentions white and black as modifiers for human races.....As with the inequality of races, Schenker believed in the inequality of tones. Here we begin to see how Schenker's racism pervaded his music theories. In short, neither racial classes, nor pitch classes, were equal in Schenker's theories. He uses the same language to express these beliefs.....his sentiment is clear: blacks must be controlled by whites. Similarly, Schenker believed notes from the fundamental structure must control other notes."

As a journal dedicated to Schenkerian studies, we find it important to foster discussion on these issues. As part of volume 12, we invite interested parties to submit essay responses to Ewell's paper. The *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* takes no official stance on the issues addressed by Ewell, and we hope to publish a variety of thoughts and perspectives. Submissions must adhere to the following guidelines:

1. Essays should be 1,000 to 3,000 words in length.
2. In order to leave sufficient time for editorial work, submissions must observe a strict deadline of January 20, 2020.

Any questions or concerns regarding submissions may be directed at the editors (Schenker@unt.edu).

Please refer to Ewell's abstract, as well as links to the presentation slides and video recording (listed below):

Music Theory's White Racial Frame

Philip Ewell (Hunter College and The Graduate Center, CUNY)

For over twenty years music theory has tried to diversify with respect to race, yet the field today remains remarkably white. SMT's most recent report on demographics shows that 90.4 percent of full-time employees in music theory are white, while 93.9 percent of associate/full professors are. Aside from this literal whiteness, there exists a figurative and even more deep-seated whiteness in music theory. This is the whiteness—which manifests itself in the composers we choose to represent our field inside and outside of the classroom, and in the theorists that we elevate to the top of our discipline—that one must practice, regardless of one's own personal racial identity, in order to call oneself a music theorist. Thus, for example, I am a black person,

¹ Coined by sociologist Joe Feagin in 2006, the term "white racial frame" refers to the "broad worldview [that is] essential to the routine legitimation, scripting, and maintenance of systemic racism in the United States."

but I am also a practitioner of “white music theory.” In this presentation, a critical-race examination of the field of music theory, I try to come to terms with music theory’s whiteness, both literal and figurative. By drawing on the writings of sociologists Joe Feagin and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, among others, I posit that there exists a “white racial frame” (Feagin) in music theory that is structural and institutionalized. Further, I highlight certain racialized structures which “exist because they benefit members of the dominant white race” (Bonilla-Silva). Ultimately, I argue that only through a deframing and reframing of this white racial frame will we begin to see positive racial changes in music theory.

PowerPoint slides: <http://philipewell.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/SMT-Plenary-Slides.pdf>

Video recording: <https://vimeo.com/372726003>

Re: Statement on JSS issue

Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>

Thu 7/30/2020 7:43 AM

To: Geoffroy-Schwinden, Rebecca <Rebecca.Geoffroy-Schwinden@unt.edu>

Dear Rebecca,

Below I have compiled the responses I have received so far. I have not heard from David Schwarz, David Heetderks, Gillian, Andrew, Timothy. Gillian told me she will get back to me later this morning. David Heetderks and I scheduled a phone call for this morning. Frank told me he was going to call David Schwarz last night. I don't expect to hear from Tim.

Stephen asked if he was allowed to sign and comment, and I said yes. I am not going to silence him. We had a long and productive talk yesterday.

Frank is planning to sign it. We talked last night.

A number of members want to sign but they are not ready to fully endorse the student response. You will see this below.

I will reach out to Andrew. I hope to have this sorted out before I teach this morning at 10 am.

Suggestions/Reactions:**From Ellen:**

"Look at us and witness this reality. Let us be an example." looks strange to me. I'm not sure I personally can be an example, even if I make my utmost best to dismantle racism. I also think that these two sentences project pathos that makes it sound suspicious.

Second, the last phrase, "dismantle and to rebuild our shared institutions" is unclear to me. Which institutions? Maybe it is at least better to at least change "institutions" to "system." Because UNT itself is also an institution, and so is SMT, and I hope we don't want to dismantle them.

And third, I cannot sign in support of the students' statement, for one reason: that statement mentions "we condemn the egregious statements written by UNT faculty members within this publication." UNT faculty members are in the plural. This must mean essays by both Jackson and Slottow. But I do not find Slottow's essay egregious. Further, the student statement wants to "condemn the whole issue," presumably the latest JSS issue. But that issue has articles that are NOT in the "symposium" and have nothing to do with Ewell's keynote address. I do not condemn those articles. So I do not support the students' statement in its entirety. I do support its main message, however. Is there a way to make the "support for students statement" more nuanced?

From Justin:

While I applaud the stand they took against racism, I'm hesitant to fully endorse the graduate students' response in the specific instance of dissolving the JSS. It seems like Schenkerian analysis is shrinking in our field and I would hate for this one very seriously flawed and damaging issue to dissolve an outlet for publishing good tonal analysis. I know from talking to Ben that the articles, at least in the past, have been peer reviewed by reputable scholars. It's clear that this symposium was not--some of them even look like email length responses. But I don't want to lose the journal as a whole. Perhaps under better leadership (from the very top, not referring to Ben Graf or Levi) it can flourish.

So I do want to sign and stand against systematic racism, but I don't support abolishing this journal. I hope it can change for the better from lessons learned here.

I already sent you Vivek's thoughtful response.

I think that we should plan on recirculating the revised version today. Everyone should then be given a chance to officially endorse the letter if they wish. I suggest we do this on some other platform other than email. I don't want to miss an email response. I think we should sent

UNT_000361

the letter to SMT, SMT-announce, AMS, SEM Dr. Phil Ewell (email and hard copy on letterhead?), a copy to JSS. NPR music reported on this this morning.. Should we send a letter to them?

Thank you, Rebecca, for leading the charge. Frank assured me that it was right to include everyone in theory area in the email. So I feel better about that.

Best,

Diego

From: "Geoffroy-Schwinden, Rebecca" <Rebecca.Geoffroy-Schwinden@unt.edu>
Date: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 at 1:04 PM
To: Diego Cubero <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Statement on JSS issue

Oops...please use this one!

From: Geoffroy-Schwinden, Rebecca <Rebecca.Geoffroy-Schwinden@unt.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 1:04 PM
To: Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Statement on JSS issue

Dear Diego,

Here is the newest version. I am wondering if you would be willing to bring this to the theory area and ask: 1. who would like to sign or make minor adjustments; and 2. where they suggest circulating it.

I am going to alert the Dean that this is being prepared and will share it with him before we circulate anywhere.

Cathy has taken it to the ethno area, I'm now taking it to history.

All best,
Rebecca

From: Geoffroy-Schwinden, Rebecca <Rebecca.Geoffroy-Schwinden@unt.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 7:11 AM
To: Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Statement on JSS issue

Thank you so much for these thoughtful comments! Here, a version that also incorporate's Cathy's suggestions.

What do you think our next steps should be? Circulate to division faculty to give an opportunity to sign and then we each send it via our respective scholarly societies? I'm open to ideas.

Thank you, again!

UNT_000362

Rebecca

From: Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 9:59 PM
To: Geoffroy-Schwinden, Rebecca <Rebecca.Geoffroy-Schwinden@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Statement on JSS issue

Dear Rebecca,

Thank you for drafting the response and welcoming my feedback. Attached are my comments. I would be happy to look it over again, if you wish.

All the best,

Diego

From: "Geoffroy-Schwinden, Rebecca" <Rebecca.Geoffroy-Schwinden@unt.edu>
Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 at 3:05 PM
To: Diego Cubero <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Subject: Statement on JSS issue

Dear Diego,

I've attached the statement regarding the recent issue of JSS, on which I welcome your feedback. We are hoping to circulate it to division faculty and then to send it to our respective societies as soon as possible.

Thank you!

All best,
Rebecca

Rebecca Dowd Geoffroy-Schwinden, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Music History
Division of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology
University of North Texas College of Music
Rebecca.Geoffroy-Schwinden@unt.edu

Vice-President, Society for Eighteenth-Century Music

Re: meeting with journal review panel Wed September 16 11am-12 noon <https://unt.zoom.us/j/5952815816>

From: "Brand, Benjamin" <benjamin.brand@unt.edu>
To: "Ishiyama, John" <john.ishiyama@unt.edu>
Cc: "Du, Jincheng" <jincheng.du@unt.edu>, "Lemberger-Truelove, Matthew" <matthew.lemberger-truelove@unt.edu>, "Wallach, Jennifer" <jennifer.wallach@unt.edu>, "Guzman, Francisco" <francisco.guzman@unt.edu>
Date: Thu, 17 Sep 2020 12:30:11 -0500

Dear John (et al.),

As a follow-up to our conversation yesterday, I would reiterate my suggestion that you ask to speak to my colleague, Dr. Ellen Bakulina. As I mentioned, she would be able to give you insight into the internal dynamics of the journal and the center. And as a young Schenkerian scholar, she also would have a good sense of the status of the journal in the field of music theory as it has developed over the past decade or so.

Thanks, once again, for pursuing this investigation.

Best,

Benjamin

Benjamin Brand, Ph.D.

Pronouns: he, him, his | Professor of Music History

Chair, Division of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology

College of Music | University of North Texas | (940) 536-3561



From: "Brand, Benjamin" <Benjamin.Brand@unt.edu>
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 at 12:20 PM
To: "Ishiyama, John" <John.Ishiyama@unt.edu>
Cc: "Du, Jincheng" <Jincheng.Du@unt.edu>, "Lemberger-Truelove, Matthew" <Matthew.Lemberger-truelove@unt.edu>, "Wallach, Jennifer" <Jennifer.Wallach@unt.edu>, "Guzman, Francisco" <Francisco.Guzman@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: meeting with journal review panel Wed September 16 11am-12 noon
<https://unt.zoom.us/j/5952815816>

Please find my statement attached.

Benjamin Brand, Ph.D.

Pronouns: he, him, his | Professor of Music History

Chair, Division of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology

College of Music | University of North Texas | (940) 536-3561



From: "Ishiyama, John" <John.Ishiyama@unt.edu>
Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 at 3:38 PM
To: "Brand, Benjamin" <Benjamin.Brand@unt.edu>
Cc: "Du, Jincheng" <Jincheng.Du@unt.edu>, "Lemberger-Truelove, Matthew" <Matthew.Lemberger-truelove@unt.edu>, "Wallach, Jennifer" <Jennifer.Wallach@unt.edu>, "Guzman, Francisco" <Francisco.Guzman@unt.edu>
Subject: meeting with journal review panel Wed September 16 11am-12 noon
<https://unt.zoom.us/j/5952815816>

Professor Brand

The committee would like to meet with you via zoom on Wednesday September 16 at 11:00 am- 12 noon. The zoom link is <https://unt.zoom.us/j/5952815816>

Thanks for your flexibility in scheduling, and we will see you on Wednesday.

best

John

John Ishiyama, Ph.D.

University Distinguished Research Professor of Political Science

Director of Graduate Studies/ Graduate Advisor

President-Elect, *American Political Science Association*



UNT_002509

Re: talk with the UNT Ad Hoc Journal Review Panel

From: "Bakulina, Ellen" <ellen.bakulina@unt.edu>
To: "Ishiyama, John" <john.ishiyama@unt.edu>
Cc: "Du, Jincheng" <jincheng.du@unt.edu>, "Wallach, Jennifer" <jennifer.wallach@unt.edu>, "Lemberger-Truelove, Matthew" <matthew.lemberger-truelove@unt.edu>, "Guzman, Francisco" <francisco.guzman@unt.edu>
Date: Fri, 02 Oct 2020 16:21:05 -0500
Attachments: Bakulina JSS response.docx (15.62 kB)

Dear John and the reviewing panel,

Here is the portion of the letter I sent to Dean Richmond on July 29, 2020, that deals with the production of JSS volume 12. (The other portion deals with the assessment of volume 12 content, rather than the editorial process.) I hope this helps your review.

I have one other point in addition to what I said earlier today. If the Journal of Schenkerian Studies continues to exit, it would be a good idea to involve people of color, as a form of recompense after the racist content of some of the volume 12 articles), in two ways: as part of the journal's leadership (there are non-white Schenkerians, and also women Schenkerians, who have not yet been involved with JSS), and as part of the content (encourage analysis of music by POC composers). As my other points, this one is only a suggestion, since I don't know what the outcome of the journal review will be.

Thank you for today's discussion,

-Ellen

From: Ishiyama, John <John.Ishiyama@unt.edu>
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2020 3:31 PM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Cc: Du, Jincheng <Jincheng.Du@unt.edu>; Wallach, Jennifer <Jennifer.Wallach@unt.edu>; Lemberger-Truelove, Matthew <Matthew.Lemberger-truelove@unt.edu>; Guzman, Francisco <Francisco.Guzman@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: talk with the UNT Ad Hoc Journal Review Panel
Professor Bakulina, sorry to send this again, I wanted to make sure you go this

Thanks for meeting with us today. you mentioned that you would send us a copy of the letter that was sent to the Dean. Could you send that to us? thanks!

best

John

John Ishiyama, Ph.D.
University Distinguished Research Professor of Political Science
Director of Graduate Studies/ Graduate Advisor
President-Elect, *American Political Science Association*
Piper Professor of Texas
Former Editor-in-Chief *American Political Science Review*

Department of Political Science,
University of North Texas,
Denton TX, 76203-5340
John.Ishiyama@unt.edu
url: <https://politicalscience.unt.edu/people/john-ishiyama>

From: Ishiyama, John <John.Ishiyama@unt.edu>
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2020 1:53 PM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>



UNT_002555

Dear Dr. Richmond,

I appreciate your concern regarding the latest issue of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies and its reception by the scholarly community. I will address your questions in two separate categories; in addition, I will also express my own reflections on the situation.

1. What was the board's role in the publication of these essays? Was the board involved in the solicitation or review of these essays?

To clarify, my answer pertains to the essays in the "Symposium on Philip Ewell's SMT 2019 Plenary Paper, 'Music Theory's White Racial Frame'," not the other articles in the same volume.

I cannot speak for the entire editorial board, so I will start by explaining what my personal role was in the publication of the "Symposium" essays. This consisted of three parts:

a) Beginning on November 15, 2019, I participated in an email exchange, initiated by Timothy Jackson, that eventually led to the Call for Responses that produced much of the "Symposium." The exchange began with Jackson's email titled "Not everyone was enthusiastic about Ewell's talk," and it was sent to a number of UNT music theory faculty. The emails were an exchange of opinions on Ewell's keynote talk. They led to another string of emails, which were directly related to the Call for responses. This string was initiated by Levi Walls, whose initial email (November 25, 2019) was sent to several theory faculty, including some that are *not* on the JSS editorial board. This second email exchange led to the formulation of the Call. I discussed the formulation with the others, but didn't make any substantive suggestions. On my part, I approved the Call on the same day, Monday 25, 2019. After that, I lost track of what happened with the further drafts of the Call, and only received the official Call for Responses via SMT-announce list (on December 31, 2019), which is the standard way to distribute music theory information.

b) Approximately at the same time when the first email exchange began, that is in mid-November, Jackson began to talk about soliciting responses to Ewell's talk, to be published in the next issue of JSS (which is what ended up happening). I stress that this was *before* the Call for Responses was published via SMT-announce, and before it was even decided that such a call would be sent out. I think (though I cannot be entirely sure) that this informal solicitation happened as part of email exchanges between Jackson and Schenkerian scholars in and outside UNT. Jackson sent to me excerpts from some of these opinion emails in the first email string (initiated on November 15, see above). There were more emails in November and December, including an email string "German scientific racism," which Jackson sent just to me. In the process of these discussions, Jackson suggested that I contact my former PhD adviser William Rothstein, a notable Schenkerian, to ask if he would like to contribute a response to Ewell's paper. Rothstein refused to do so, in an email to me from December 3, 2019. c) At some point in the spring 2020, Walls sent me a draft of the table of contents for the "Symposium." I said that the titles looked inconsistent. (They still do, in print.) I was never asked to look at the essays themselves, only at their titles.



UNT_002559

This concludes my participation in the JSS “Symposium on Philip Ewell’s SMT 2019 Plenary Paper.” I knew that several people were working on their responses to Ewell, but never saw any of these essays, at any stage of their preparation or publication. The next time I heard about the “Symposium” was in a Facebook post on Saturday, July 25. The first time I saw these essays in print was the next day, July 26, when a Facebook friend distributed a scanned pdf copy of the “Symposium.”

In summary, I was involved in the solicitation of these essays (though not those that were actually published), but I was not involved in their review.

The facts having been discussed, I now wish to express my own reflections on the process.

First of all, it is hard to distinguish between three things here: (1) what the JSS editorial board did, (2) what the broader Schenkerian community did, and (3) what UNT theory faculty did, in email conversations with Jackson and others. Jackson’s and Walls’s emails, at least those I myself got, were addressed not so much to the editorial board, but to UNT faculty, including those (like Andrew Chung) that are NOT on the editorial board. At the same time, Jackson alluded, more than once, to other Schenkerians (without naming them) who agreed with his own opinion. In retrospect, I can say that Jackson’s (and to a certain extent Stephen Slottow’s) actions produced an atmosphere of “we Schenkerians do not agree with Ewell’s plenary talk,” and this atmosphere was created not just by emails, but also by in-person conversations in UNT music building hallways. To be sure, Jackson himself expressed his disagreement very clearly in his emails, a lot of which later became part of his essay in JSS “Symposium.” Jackson was “dragging” people into his “Symposium” project, and they (I should actually say “we”) followed with various degrees of enthusiasm or reluctance. I stayed away from active participation in it as much as I could manage it without explicitly telling Jackson and Slottow “Sorry, I don’t want to be involved.”

As for the rest of the editorial board—the members who are *not* on the UNT faculty—I simply don’t know whether they were involved in the formulation of the Call for Responses, or in any other stages of the process. The reason is that there was never a *formal* solicitation of opinions or essay reviews from the editorial board members.

In retrospect, I regret that I did not contact Ewell to ask if he would like to write a response to the responses, or to simply inform him about what is happening in JSS. A lack of such timely contact with Ewell on the part of JSS editorship is part of what is currently being condemned on social media. In fact, I did think of contacting him in December 2019, partly because he is a

3

long-time friend and a former mentor of mine. But it was a busy time at the end of the Fall semester, I was recovering after an illness, and most of all I thought that such contact ultimately should be made by the editors and the advisory board (that is, Graf, Wall, Jackson, Slottow). So I didn’t write to Ewell. Now I think that this inaction was negligence. I should have at least urged the editors to get in touch with Ewell. Also, I now understand that, probably, the whole editorial board should have reviewed the essays at some point, since they engage the extremely sensitive topic of race and the work of a scholar (Ewell) who is courageous enough to publicly show his vulnerability in his SMT keynote.

I also think that a lack of formal communication between the advisory board, the editorial board, and the editors is part of a larger problem. Throughout the three years I have been a member of the editorial

board, communication has been extremely inconsistent and unclear. At times, Jackson sends emails, often enormously voluminous, to multiple board members and non-JSS-affiliated UNT faculty, and it is unclear whether a response would be just in the spirit of friendship and collegiality, or whether this is official interaction between JSS officers and board members. Jackson's emails and his Schenker-style graphs attached to them are sometimes so big that it even seems irresponsible to send them and to expect people to read them. It is disrespectful of his colleagues' time. Further signs of inconsistency: in the summer 2017, Jackson asked me to review and/or proofread the entire (!) issue of JSS that was to come out that summer, within one day's notice. Putting off other duties, I read much of the issue within one day of his message and gave substantive comments, after which Jackson informed me that the journal issue has already gone into print, and my comments are too late. I have never felt as unappreciated as I did on that day.

In short, the communication between the advisory board (*especially* Jackson) and the rest of the JSS team is far from ideal. The role of the editorial board is unclear, and Jackson's actions often blurs the boundary between the JSS editorial board and UNT theory faculty.

(I must also say that I was an anonymous reviewer for one of the articles in the latest JSS issue, "The tour-of-key model" by Nicholas Stoia. This review process was very well organized and caused no problems. My contact during this review process was Benjamin Graf.)

Message


From: Brand, Benjamin [Benjamin.Brand@unt.edu]
Sent: 5/17/2021 4:51:46 PM
To: Cowley, Jennifer [Jennifer.Cowley@unt.edu]; Stowers, Renaldo [Renaldo.Stowers@untsystem.edu]; Richmond, John [John.Richmond@unt.edu]
Subject: FW: [Smt-Announce] Call for Applications: Editor of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies

Dear Jennifer, John, and Renaldo,

The call for applications for a new editor of the JSS has been publicized on the SMT email list. Applications are due July 30. The search committee will begin its review of them shortly thereafter.

All the best,
Benjamin

Benjamin Brand, Ph.D.
Pronouns: he, him, his | Professor of Music History
Chair, Division of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology
College of Music | University of North Texas | (940) 536-3561



From: Smt-announce <smt-announce-bounces@lists.societymusictheory.org> on behalf of Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Sent: Saturday, May 15, 2021 4:22 PM
To: smt-announce@lists.societymusictheory.org <smt-announce@lists.societymusictheory.org>
Cc: Napoles, Jessica <Jessica.Napoles@unt.edu>
Subject: [EXT] [Smt-Announce] Call for Applications: Editor of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies

Dear Colleagues,

The University of North Texas (UNT) is seeking applications for a new editor or editorial team for the *Journal of Schenkerian Studies*. Editor(s) will serve a 3-year term, beginning (tentatively) no later than January 2022. We hope that the new editor(s) will help rejuvenate the journal, redefine it in light of the current state of music theory as a field, and restructure and rebrand it to promote its long term viability. We are open to the possibility of teams of co-editors, and/or editors with associate editors, applying for the editorial role. The relationships between the journal and its institutional stakeholders can be examined and revised where appropriate.

The Journal of Schenkerian Studies is the only peer-reviewed research journal featuring articles on all facets of Schenkerian thought, including theory, analysis, pedagogy, historical aspects, and reviews of relevant publications. It currently is published annually by the Center for Schenkerian Studies and the University of North Texas Press.

Previous issues of the journal can be found here:
<https://digital.library.unt.edu/explore/collections/JSCS>

The University of North Texas Press co-publishes the journal with the Center and/or journal editor. The Press receives final print-ready files from the Editor and arranges for print publication and dissemination to subscribers for each annual issue. Within one year of print publication the journal is loaded with the UNT Libraries for open access.

Job description/responsibilities:

The editor is responsible for developing a process for determining editorial board membership, terms and length of service, and restructuring of journal guidelines. The editor will also ensure a fair and high-quality peer review of articles written in (or related to) the traditions of prolongational analysis.

The journal is expected to abide by the Committee on Publications Ethics (COPE) guidelines regarding best practices in editorial management.

https://publicationethics.org/files/COPE_G_A4_SG_Ethical_Editing_May19_SCREEN_AW-website.pdf

Minimum Qualifications:

A record of sustained, high-quality research publication in peer-reviewed research journals
Expertise in Schenkerian analysis/Schenkerian studies

Preferred Qualification:

Editorial experience, as either an editor or an editorial board member of a research journal

Applications should include:

a cover letter with expression of interest in the position, including the candidate's goals for the journal
a curriculum vitae, including all contact information for the applicant
a list of 3 references with current contact information

Inquiries, nominations, and application materials should be directed to the search committee chair, Jessica Nápoles via email at Jessica.Napoles@unt.edu. Search committee members include:

Dr. Ellen Bakulina, Assistant Professor of Music Theory, UNT

Mr. Ron Chrisman, Director, UNT Press

Dr. Graham Hunt, Professor of Music Theory, UT Arlington

Dr. John Ishiyama, University Distinguished Research Professor of Political Science, UNT

Dr. Jessica Nápoles, Associate Professor of Choral Music Education, UNT

All applications must be submitted electronically in a single .pdf. Review of applications begins July 30th and will remain open until filled.